

**MINUTES** of the meeting of the **COMMUNITIES, ENVIRONMENT AND HIGHWAYS SELECT COMMITTEE** held at 10.00 am on 12 February 2025 at Council Chamber, Woodhatch Place, 11 Cockshot Hill, Woodhatch, Reigate RH2 8EF.

These minutes are subject to confirmation by the Committee at its meeting on Thursday, 10 April 2025.

**Elected Members:**

- \* Catherine Baart
- \* John Beckett
- Luke Bennett
- Liz Bowes
- \* Stephen Cooksey
- \* Andy MacLeod
- \* Jan Mason
- Cameron McIntosh
- \* Lance Spencer (Vice-Chairman)
- v Mark Sugden (Vice-Chairman)
- \* Richard Tear
- Buddhi Weerasinghe
- \* Keith Witham (Chairman)
  
- \* *present*
- v *present, virtual*

**8/25 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS [Item 1]**

Apologies were received from Councillor Luke Bennett, Councillor Liz Bowes (substituted by Councillor Robert Hughes), Councillor Cameron McIntosh (substituted by Councillor David Harmer), and Councillor Buddhi Weerasinghe (substituted by Councillor Helyn Clack).

**9/25 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETINGS [Item 2]**

The Committee **AGREED** the minutes from the 5 December 2024 and 13 January 2025 meetings as a true and accurate record.

**10/25 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 3]**

None received.

**11/25 QUESTIONS AND PETITIONS [Item 4]**

There was one question received from a member of the public, in writing, prior to the Committee meeting. The question and answer were provided in the agenda circulated prior to the meeting.

The same member of the public was present at the Committee meeting and asked a supplementary question regarding how Surrey County Council planned to improve resilience to extreme flood events, especially at vulnerable locations like bridges, and how the Council's flood risk management strategy would enhance flood resilience for critical infrastructure such as road bridges that connect communities across the county. In reply,

Marisa Heath, Cabinet Member for Environment, acknowledged the concern and highlighted the importance of treating flooding as a priority. She mentioned discussions with DEFRA about increasing funding for climate adaptation and emphasised the need to improve resilience and communication. She also noted the importance of collaboration among stakeholders and communities to tackle the issue effectively. Doug Hill, the Flood and Climate Resilience Manager, explained the complexity of managing flood risk in the county, particularly in large catchments like the Mole. He mentioned ongoing assessments of the risk to assets and infrastructure and the importance of keeping the network open and ensuring safety around bridges. He invited the member of the public to a face-to-face meeting to discuss the details further and work out a plan of action.

The Chairman asked about the recent decision to stop officers from attending flood forum meetings, either in person or remotely. He expressed concern that this decision could undermine the purpose and effectiveness of these forums and requested that the matter be looked into. The Cabinet Member for Environment emphasised the importance of flood forums for community resilience and preparedness. She acknowledged the resource constraints and the increasing frequency of flooding, which stretched the Team's capacity, suggesting that they needed to find a way to consolidate efforts to ensure effective collaboration with flood forums, even if officers could not attend every meeting. The Flood and Climate Resilience Manager stated that the issue was not about the inability to attend meetings but about prioritising resources effectively. He mentioned that flood groups worked best when the right person was present to address specific issues, such as highway drainage, and that flood groups needed to be self-maintaining. He also mentioned recent funding approval to get support from the National Flood Forum for several flood groups, particularly those affected by recent flooding.

### **ACTIONS AND REQUESTS FOR FURTHER INFORMATION**

- Flood and Climate Resilience Manager to provide the Committee information on the decision to stop officers attending flood forum meetings.

## **12/25 RIGHTS OF WAY IMPROVEMENT PLAN [Item 5]**

### **WITNESSES**

- Marisa Heath, Cabinet Member for Environment
- Simon Crowther, Executive Director for Environment, Property & Growth
- Carolyn McKenzie, Director for Environment
- Claire Saunders, Access Team Manager
- Katie McDonald, Natural Capital Group Manager

### **KEY LINES OF DISCUSSION**

1. The Chairman asked about the financial implications associated with making the necessary improvements to the condition of public rights of way, as stated in the Rights of Way Improvement Plan (ROWIP). In reply, the Natural Capital Group Manager said that funding for maintaining public rights of way came from three main sources: a

revenue budget from the Council, a capital programme, and funding from new developments. The capital programme was significantly increased approximately four years ago and was expected to remain at the current level in the Council's budget. Funding from new developments allowed for meeting residents' expectations and enhancing connectivity between villages and communities across Surrey. Despite limited resources, a prioritisation process was used for all enquiries and requests related to rights of way, considering factors such as safety, path usage, and the benefits to different users.

2. A Member asked about plans for staff resources to utilise Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) opportunities and the barriers to engaging more volunteer groups in maintaining structures. In reply, the Cabinet Member for Environment mentioned that they had recently agreed to allocate half a million into Greener Futures and emphasised the importance of considering rights of way within that funding. She highlighted the need for better connections with planning authorities to avoid missed opportunities and ensure that new systems reflected and captured these opportunities, while also stressing the importance of understanding key issues across the county and prioritising members' input on valuable rights of way for residents.
3. A Member asked about the 81 recorded gaps relating to cross-border issues and emphasised the importance of ensuring councillors in those divisions were aware of these gaps. The Natural Capital Group Manager highlighted the importance of prioritising which groups to work with first, noting the enthusiasm of the Team and the significant contribution of volunteers, who made up 50% of the workforce. She mentioned the focus on engaging users who currently did not use the countryside estate, such as young people, young families, people with disabilities, and those from disadvantaged areas or ethnic minorities. She also discussed opportunities to collaborate with other Council areas and mentioned specific initiatives for people with disabilities, such as all-access trails on the countryside estates.
4. A Member asked about the measurement of usage for footpaths and rights of way, particularly in high-traffic areas like Woking town centre. The Natural Capital Group Manager explained the challenges of monitoring footpath usage, noting that while people counters could be used, they often captured wildlife as well. She mentioned that Hampshire used phone data for this purpose, and the Service is exploring collaboration with them due to reduced costs. The Service already monitors the canal in Woking but was considering the cost and benefit of continuous measurement.
5. A Member asked about the differences in methods and rules between his division and Hampshire regarding rights of way. The Access Team Manager said that Hampshire County Council had not completed the process of reclassifying roads used as public paths. She mentioned that discrepancies arose at county boundaries where different local authorities had varying evidence to classify rights of way. This issue required significant officer input and research to resolve, which could be time-consuming.
6. A Member asked what more could be done to support the Rights of Way Team and ensure the effective delivery of the new plan, given the significant response from parish councils, the public, and people outside the county. The Cabinet Member for Environment emphasised the importance of conserving Surrey's heritage. She highlighted the value of local knowledge and coordination in identifying issues and

- improving rights of way. She also stressed the importance of collaboration with various groups and aligning investment priorities to integrate the plan into local plans effectively.
7. A Member asked about the risks faced by implementing the new plan. The Natural Capital Group Manager emphasised the importance of preserving current budgets for rights of way and managing expectations, as the document might raise expectations beyond what could be delivered. She highlighted the need for effective communication and prioritisation. The Cabinet Member for Environment said that the document provided a clear pathway for improvements, though actual implementation might take time and depend on additional resources. She stressed the importance of guiding the plan through the process and linking it to broader county work.
  8. A Member asked if it was permissible to use funds like the Small Fund Surrey for addressing issues such as deteriorating bridleways and footpaths, and whether Councillors could collaborate to pool resources for significant costs to push forward initiatives. The Cabinet Member for Environment said that using funds like the Small Fund Surrey for such projects should be possible, as similar funds were used for highways projects. She suggested including it in the Greener Futures priority list to show how the money could be spent effectively, emphasising the value of sharing costs.
  9. A Member asked about the progress on delivering the actions and how it would be monitored and reported to the Council and the public. The Cabinet Member for Environment emphasised the need for an annual tracking record of rights of way improvements to better communicate spending and progress. She also highlighted the importance of reviewing Section 106 funding (financial contributions made by developers to the local authority to help fund infrastructure and services) and improving staff engagement for meaningful outcomes. The Natural Capital Group Manager said that an annual access report was produced and circulated to all Members, detailing the work done each year. This report would be adapted to reflect the objectives and actions in the ROWIP, and additional KPIs (Key Performance Indicators) were being considered for corporate reporting.
  10. A Member asked about the continued collaboration with parish councils, particularly in maintaining footpaths and rights of way that were technically the Council's responsibility but were currently impassable. He also inquired about addressing the issue of routes being used by trail bikes and four-by-fours, and how the Council planned to work with parish councils in areas like Farley Green. The Cabinet Member for Environment said it was important to empower parish councils and collaborate with them to maintain footpaths and rights of way. She highlighted the need to balance the Council's responsibilities with allowing parish councils, who had local knowledge, to take on more tasks. She also mentioned the need to revisit discussions with SALC (Surrey Association of Local Parish Councils) to establish a clear direction for engagement. The Director for Environment said that there were regular meetings with SALC to discuss joint efforts across environmental agendas, including public rights of way.
  11. A Member asked if successful projects, such as the clearing of a bridleway in his division, could be publicised through the media or the Parish Council. In reply, the Cabinet Member for Environment said that

a potential model similar to Highways, where they reported on the number of verges and pavements cleared, could be adopted. She proposed creating an infographic or similar report every three months to publicise the number of rights of way cleared, making it easier for everyone to share the information.

12. A Member asked about ROWIP's links to LTP4, Vision Zero, and Safe Routes to Schools, and how these initiatives were practically implemented. The Cabinet Member for Environment stated that ensuring collaboration across different teams and portfolios was essential for linking LTP4, Vision Zero, and Safe Routes to Schools. This work had highlighted the need for better connectivity between planning, highways, environment, and flooding, which would be a focus in future collaborative meetings. The Executive Director for Environment, Property & Growth stated that prioritising projects, such as improving safe routes to school, would be part of the criteria for allocating funding. He emphasised the importance of working closely with colleagues in Highways to operationalise these priorities.
13. A Member asked about the challenges of dealing with numerous organisations. In reply, the Cabinet Member for Environment acknowledged resource challenges and emphasised the need to channel engagement into organisations like SALC and SCAF. She highlighted the difficulty of working with district and parish councils to ensure effective communication from representative bodies across the county. The Natural Capital Group Manager added that the Team took their duty to ensure everyone's views were heard very seriously. She mentioned ways to push ahead if necessary, such as bringing conflicts to local committees or through their own governance process. She offered to assist with any unresolved issues and expressed confidence in the Team's ability to address issues that had reached an impasse.
14. A Member raised a concern about a footpath access issue at the Highlands Flats in Farnham, questioning whether proper transport assessments, including footpath considerations, had been made during planning applications. The Access Team Manager said that while they were consulted and had put forward their requests, these were not always reflected by the planning authority. The Manager said that the area officers handled these issues, but often by the time they reached this point, the funding had run out.

### **ACTIONS AND REQUESTS FOR FURTHER INFORMATION**

- Natural Capital Group Manager - Provide approximate budget information, or the details available from the past three budgets, to be circulated to the Committee.
- Natural Capital Group Manager - Provide a summary with key points and objectives of the ROWIP to the Committee.

### **RECOMMENDATION**

**RESOLVED**, The Communities, Environment and Highways Select Committee

- I. Recognises the high level of consultation that was achieved. The Committee thanks the team for their work. The Committee supports

the draft Rights of Way Improvement Plan and the 11 priority objectives described.

- II. Requests that Cabinet prioritises the actions necessary to maintain our public rights of way and reports back briefly to the Committee on progress against actions 8-11 within six months.
- III. Notes that the Council cannot deliver the plan without extensive collaborative working with partners; the Committee therefore requests that Cabinet ensures that Council officers, stakeholders and volunteers are properly supported.
- IV. Requests that this work is joined up across all Council services, including Leisure services, Public Health, Local Transport Planning and Vision Zero initiatives that the Council is undertaking.
- V. Requests that Cabinet reviews the process for informing local Members on progress against the ROWIP.

### **13/25 SURREY CLIMATE CHANGE ADAPTATION STRATEGY [Item 6]**

#### **WITNESSES**

- Marisa Heath, Cabinet Member for Environment
- Simon Crowther, Executive Director for Environment, Property & Growth
- Carolyn McKenzie, Director for Environment
- Sarah Birch, Climate Change Adaptation Specialist

#### **KEY LINES OF DISCUSSION**

1. A Member asked about expectations regarding the response from central government and the timeline for receiving an update on climate change adaptation. The Director for Environment said that there were no specific expectations at the moment, but there had been indications from partners about wanting further conversations, though the details were not yet clear.
2. A Member asked about the level of engagement from other partners, such as districts, boroughs, and parish and town councils, regarding the strategy. In reply, the Cabinet Member for Environment said that the Greener Futures Partnership Group, which includes relevant cabinet members for the environment and officers, had strong engagement at an officer level across the districts and boroughs. She emphasised the need for more resources to engage more deeply with all partners, as it was a partnership effort, and mentioned that they were considering how to achieve this. The Director for Environment said that initial conversations around the strategic agenda had taken place with town councils, but more detailed follow-up was needed, especially when conducting risk assessments. The Climate Change Adaptation Specialist stated that her work on adaptation and climate change-related risks was integrated with other partnerships and boards, making it a collaborative effort rather than a standalone one.
3. A Member asked about the allocation of £500,000 recently added to the Greener Future scheme, and whether some of it would go towards supporting climate change adaptation. The Cabinet Member for Environment stated that there was cross-party agreement at the full Council meeting to allocate funds to this initiative. The Cabinet Member for Environment emphasised the importance of tangible

responses to climate change to re-engage residents. She stated her desire to increase resources allocated to the scheme. The Executive Director for Environment, Property & Growth stated that the increase in allocation was implemented recently and that the Department would explore how to allocate the additional funding.

The Committee **NOTED** the report.

## **14/25 WASTE INFRASTRUCTURE UPDATE [Item 7]**

### **WITNESSES**

- Natalie Bramhall, Cabinet Member for Property, Waste and Infrastructure
- Simon Crowther, Executive Director for Environment, Property & Growth
- Steven Foster, Director for Waste
- Jade-Ashlee Cox-Rawling, Head of Strategy and Policy for Waste

### **KEY LINES OF DISCUSSION**

1. The Chairman asked about how the project would be affected in the next year given local government reform. The Executive Director for Environment, Property & Growth stated that the infrastructure plan was designed to support the entirety of Surrey County. He highlighted that over 90% of the Service's expenditure and service delivery was through two main contracts, which would continue for at least another five years. Breaking down the waste disposal function to reflect new organisational structures would have significant implications for those contracts. He suggested continuing to operate in a holistic manner on behalf of Surrey County Council or the future authorities in Surrey for the medium term and then reflecting on the changes when more information became available.
2. A Member asked about the apparent conflict between the short-term focus mentioned in the discussion and the 30-year plan outlined in the executive summary. The Head of Strategy and Policy for Waste said that the short-term focus was on maintaining the programme of work and assets for waste across Surrey, regardless of potential divisions. The aim was to create inter-authority agreements for asset use. She clarified that the plan included assessing available assets for waste treatment across the Southeast, leading to recommendations and business cases for infrastructure within their geographical area. The need for long-term assets and infrastructure became relevant in the context of the 30-year plan.
3. A Member asked about the risks involved in building the new materials recycling facility, the likelihood of the project succeeding, and whether there was a Plan B if it did not succeed. The Head of Strategy and Policy for Waste stated that the primary risk to the new recycling facility was the planning application process. The application had been submitted and validated, with positive stakeholder engagements addressing concerns about noise, pollution, and transport. Ongoing discussions with planning colleagues aimed to ensure all concerns were addressed. The site had been identified in the Surrey West local plan and was known to the new development of Long Cross. As for a

Plan B, the only option would be to look to the market, which would involve sending waste further afield and increasing capacity requirements on the waste transfer station network. She emphasised the need for more space due to collection and packaging reforms and stated that she preferred delivering the facility to a site in Surrey to create a circular economy around the materials.

4. A Member asked about the discussions taking place with the third-party Materials Recycling Facility (MRF) within Surrey and whether there was sufficient material for both the existing and new facilities. The Head of Strategy and Policy for Waste stated that there were three third-party MRFs: in Leatherhead, Colnbrook, and one near London. The Service's plans were transparent, and they had been in discussions with contractors about their intentions once the contract ended in 2029. Specifically, regarding the Leatherhead MRF, the Head of Strategy and Policy for Waste stated that she was in conversation with Mole Valley, which had chosen to pursue a self-sufficient approach. This decision led the Service to proceed with the plan. She assured the Committee that the proposal would satisfy all residents and that the Service could handle more material if needed. Additionally, a dual solution involving the Leatherhead site would be beneficial as it would create more infrastructure within the area.
5. A Member asked about the implementation of the extended producer responsibility initiative under the Environment Act, 2021, specifically how it would work, how arrangements with borough councils would be made to collect more materials, how efficiency would be measured, and what income could be expected from it. The Head of Strategy and Policy for Waste said that Surrey County Council would receive £20.3 million next year from extended producer responsibility, with £9.3 million allocated to Surrey County Council and £10.9 million to districts and boroughs. The methods for measuring effectiveness and efficiency were still being determined, and the organisation was seeking clarity from DEFRA (Department for Environment, Food & Rural Affairs). She emphasised the need for collaboration with districts and boroughs and mentioned the development of a decarbonisation transition plan. The new legislation would also standardise recycling materials collection, supporting the materials recycling facility.
6. A Member said they were concerned about the long-distance transportation of waste and proposed a joint venture to construct a local facility for processing waste within Surrey. They highlighted the potential benefits of cost savings, positive climatic impact, and possible income from other authorities. The Head of Strategy and Policy for Waste noted that having a Materials Recycling Facility (MRF) within Surrey would provide the necessary economies of scale. She emphasised the opportunity to work with packaging producers and create a circular economy within Surrey. The Executive Director for Environment, Property & Growth stated that he agreed with the principle of being as self-contained as possible and mentioned the challenges faced in obtaining incineration capacity within the county. The Director for Waste added that waste management in Surrey had a long history and highlighted the enthusiasm from local residents for the MRF during pre-consultation. He supported the investment in infrastructure across Surrey and emphasised the importance of a countywide approach to waste management.
7. A Member asked about the primary outcomes desired from the re-procurement of the waste service contract, the risks involved, and



potential savings. The Head of Strategy and Policy for Waste stated that the waste service contract would run until 30 September 2029, and re-procurement was necessary. Further disaggregation of services could create additional savings and allow greater market competition. The aim was to achieve the best value for taxpayers, ensure continuity of services, and consider the best environmental solutions. The two main risks identified were the market's ability to deliver and the programme's timely delivery, which would be mitigated through soft market testing and early preparation.

8. A Member asked about the cost-benefit analysis of the reuse hubs, including their soft benefits, and whether they were making a significant impact on the black bag situation. The Head of Strategy and Policy for Waste said that the focus should be on the number of items prevented from being put in the black bag rather than the tonnage. They estimated that over 170,000 products would be diverted from the black bag this year, generating an income of around £1 million. They emphasised the significant impact of reuse and highlighted the potential for further initiatives at the reuse hub at IBD, including repair cafés and furniture reuse. They also mentioned the possibility of expanding reuse shops at community recycling centres, balancing space constraints with maximising diversion.
9. A Member asked about the risks associated with the new arrangement where Surrey County Council would bear the maintenance costs previously managed by SUEZ, and whether the Department had any control over the required level of maintenance. The Executive Director for Environment, Property & Growth provided context on the renegotiation of the PFI (Private Finance Initiative) contract, explaining that Surrey County Council chose to take back the risk for life cycle works on the assets for five years. He mentioned that assessments with SUEZ estimated the cost over five years to be around £10 million, and the financial risk was considered minimal with sufficient provision for that period. SUEZ assured the Department that Surrey County Council would have a say in the maintenance process, with ongoing dialogue between both parties to discuss and agree on the necessary actions.

### **RECOMMENDATION**

**RESOLVED**, The Communities, Environment and Highways Select Committee

- I. Welcomes the initiative to comply with the Environment Act (2021) and the re-procurement of the Council's outsourced waste management services.
- II. Notes that redevelopment of Doman Road Waste Transfer Site is dependent on Cabinet's approval of the Full Business Case.
- III. Requests that Cabinet ensures that the business case is robust before proceeding further.

### **15/25 SURREY FIRE AND RESCUE SERVICE PERFORMANCE [Item 8]**

#### **WITNESSES**

- Kevin Deanus, Cabinet Member for Fire and Rescue, and Resilience

- Jon Simpson, Assistant Chief Fire Officer, Community Resilience
- Elizabeth Lacey, Assistant Director for Organisational Development

## KEY LINES OF DISCUSSION

1. The Chairman inquired about the lessons learned from the cause for concern identified in Spring 2023, and whether these lessons could be applied more broadly to the service to prevent similar issues in the future. In response, the Assistant Chief Fire Officer stated that identifying the cause for concern and implementing corrective actions provided valuable insights. Improvements were made to the risk-based inspection programme using updated National Fire Chiefs Council (NFCC) methodologies and internal audits. A follow-up plan was established, and engagement with stakeholders helped refine the process. Internal audits and National Fire Chief Council Fire Standards were utilised to review ourselves against and to maintain professional standards, and fire station assurance processes were conducted on a rolling basis.
2. A Member inquired whether all targeted partners had completed the emergency service interoperability principles training and how the training's effectiveness and improvements could be measured. The Assistant Chief Fire Officer responded that the JESIP (Joint Emergency Services Interoperability Principles) training for partners was the responsibility of their respective organisations, so he could not confirm their training status or evaluate the impact. However, he noted that JESIP principles, introduced in 2012, were scalable and routinely observed in day-to-day multi-agency incidents. He also noted that SFRS (Surrey Fire and Rescue Service) have significantly increased the number of multi-agency exercises that our frontline crews and officers undertake with blue light partners. This is a tangible way to observe JESIP principles in practice.
3. A Member asked about the benefits observed so far from the performance conversation tool currently under review and how its implementation with frontline staff was progressing. The Assistant Director for Organisational Development replied that, based on feedback, the new tool would be implemented soon. The updated template focused on well-being, work demands, support mechanisms, and leadership. It included sections on attendance, core skills, and fitness standards. The form aimed to align with performance conversations, identify trends, spot areas for improvement, and recognise good performance. It emphasised well-being, career growth, and clear communication to foster a collaborative work environment.
4. A Member inquired about the reasons for the Fire Service's lower response rate to Freedom of Information (FOI) requests compared to the Council-wide average. The Assistant Director for Organisational Development explained that the increase in the number and complexity of FOI requests, reliance on multiple teams for information, changes in key contacts, and the need to redact confidential information contributed to the delays in responses.
5. A Member asked about the reasons for the Fire Service's lower response rate to corporate complaints compared to the Council's normal measurements. The Assistant Director for Organisational Development stated that the low number of complaints meant that even a few delayed responses significantly impacted the performance

- measure. Similar to FOIs, these complaints were often complex and required coordination with multiple teams, which could cause delays.
6. A Member inquired how the information gathered from Safe and Well visits and business safety visits could be made more useful by sharing themes with other parts of the Council, and other districts and boroughs, while ensuring that personal data is not shared. The Assistant Chief Fire Officer responded that Safe and Well visits, as well as business safety visits, were conducted in collaboration with multiple agencies to maximise benefits and avoid repeated visits. The partnership offices, a coordinated team within the Prevention Team, managed these efforts, emphasising extensive partnership work. He also mentioned that formal reviews were regularly conducted with partners, particularly from Surrey County Council, to learn from incidents.
  7. A Member asked whether fall issues were still recorded during safe and well visits to residents' properties, particularly for elderly individuals with care packages. She also inquired if trip hazards were reported back to Adult Social Care and how much of this information could be shared with other relevant services. The Assistant Chief Fire Officer confirmed that fall issues were still recorded during Safe and Well visits. He highlighted a pilot project where a Home and Fire Safety Coordinator ensured homes were safe for individuals returning from hospital stays. This role received positive feedback and aimed to address challenges like releasing hospital capacity and supporting vulnerable individuals. Additionally, he mentioned the Community Risk Management Plan, which included initiatives like falls assist to improve residents' lives.
  8. The Chairman noted that fire fatalities had historically been low in Surrey. He requested up-to-date information on the number of fire-related fatalities in Surrey over the past few years, specifically whether the numbers had been increasing or decreasing. He also asked for statistics on rescue work, particularly road traffic collisions, and how the level of work had changed over the years. Additionally, he inquired about the frequency of public communications from Surrey Fire and Rescue on social media, specifically Facebook, and requested an up-to-date post to keep the public informed about their work. The Assistant Chief Fire Officer stated that monthly updates were still posted on various social media platforms, including the number of incidents the Service attended, average response time, and the number of Safe and Well visits conducted. He committed to ensuring that these updates were shared with the Committee. He also clarified that the pilot role mentioned earlier was an additional post within the Prevention Team, not affecting emergency response roles. He emphasised the potential of the pilot project and the use of an experienced Partnership Officer to take on this role, with plans to backfill the gap in capacity.

### **ACTIONS AND REQUESTS FOR FURTHER INFORMATION**

- Assistant Chief Fire Officer – Provide up-to-date information to the Committee on the number of fire-related fatalities in Surrey over the past few years, specifically whether the numbers have been increasing or decreasing.

- Assistant Chief Fire Officer – Provide statistics on rescue work, particularly road traffic collisions, and how the level of work has changed over the years.
- Assistant Chief Fire Officer – Provide Members of the Council the frequency of public communications from Surrey Fire and Rescue on social media, specifically Facebook, and requested an up-to-date post to keep the public informed about their work.

### **RECOMMENDATION**

**RESOLVED**, The Communities, Environment and Highways Select Committee

- I. Recognises the significant progress that Surrey Fire and Rescue Service has made in response to His Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary and Fire and Rescue Services' inspection;
- II. Welcomes the Service's response to the inspection's cause for concern;
- III. Recommends that Cabinet satisfies itself that the Service's JESIP training has improved inter-agency working with partners.

### **16/25 CABINET RESPONSE TO SELECT COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS [Item 9]**

The Chairman introduced the response to the Select Committee recommendations from the Budget 2025/26 and Medium-Term Financial Strategy.

The Committee **NOTED** the Cabinet response to its recommendations.

### **17/25 RECOMMENDATIONS TRACKER AND FORWARD WORK PROGRAMME [Item 10]**

The Chairman invited the committee to review the progress and updates related to the actions and recommendations tracker and forward work programme.

#### **FORWARD WORK PROGRAMME**

1. A Member raised concerns about the effectiveness of new line marking machines and the quality of pothole repairs observed during a visit to the Merrow Depot. He requested reports on both the efficiency of the machines and the quality of the pothole repairs, as there are still complaints about the latter.

The Committee **NOTED** the Member's concerns for the upcoming item, the action and recommendation tracker and the forward work programme.

### **18/25 DATE OF THE NEXT SCHEDULED MEETING [Item 11]**

The Committee **NOTED** its next meeting is scheduled to be held on Thursday, 10 April 2025.

Meeting ended at: 1.22pm

---

**Chairman**

This page is intentionally left blank