

MINUTES  
OF A MEETING OF THE  
**SURREY FIRST JOINT COMMITTEE**

Held on 26 July 2010 at Woking Borough Council

Present:

Cllr J Furey, Runnymede BC (Chairman)  
Mr P Williams, Surrey Police Authority (Vice-Chairman)

Cllr J O'Reilly, Elmbridge BC  
Cllr T Rooth, Guildford BC  
Cllr C Hunt, Mole Valley DC  
Cllr D Hodge, Surrey CC

Cllr M Gibson, Surrey Heath BC  
Cllr T Elias, Tandridge DC  
Cllr R Knowles, Waverley BC  
Cllr J Kingsbury, Woking BC

Secretariat:

Ms P Morrow, Director  
Ms N Scrutton, Support Officer

Also Present:

Mr R Moran, Elmbridge BC  
Mr S Davies, Epsom & Ewell BC  
Mr M Lumley, Epsom & Ewell BC  
Ms J Coslett, Guildford BC  
Ms L Taylor, Mole Valley DC  
Mr G Cook, Reigate & Banstead BC  
Mr P Turrell, Runnymede BC

Ms C Millar, Surrey CC  
Mr M Willis, Surrey Heath BC  
CC M Rowley, Surrey Police  
Mr S Weigel, Tandridge DC  
Ms M Orton, Waverley BC  
Mr R Morgan, Woking BC

**1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND NOTICES OF SUBSTITUTION**

Apologies for absence were received as follows:

Councillor Keith Mann, Epsom & Ewell Borough Council  
Councillor Joan Spiers, Reigate & Banstead District Council  
Councillor John Packman, Spelthorne Borough Council  
Councillor Gordon Keymer, Tandridge District Council

**2. MINUTES**

It was noted that Mr Peter Williams had not been recorded as present at the last meeting. This was incorrect and it was agreed that the record be amended accordingly.

**RESOLVED:**

That the minutes of the meeting of the Joint Committee held on 28 June 2010 be approved, amended as agreed, and signed as a true and correct record.

**3. URGENT BUSINESS**

No items of urgent business were received.

#### **4. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

No declarations of interest were received.

#### **5. WORKSHOP FOR MEMBERS OF THE JOINT COMMITTEE**

The Committee considered proposals for a half day introductory workshop for Members of the Joint Committee in September. The workshop would be used to:

- ◆ secure commitment to the concept of collaborative arrangements in the form of Surrey First;
- ◆ share and explore the limits of partner commitment to aspects of Surrey First;
- ◆ share and explore other partnership arrangements outside Surrey First in order to ensure transparency;
- ◆ review progress to date to develop the Surrey First model;
- ◆ discuss and agree the six Surrey First objectives and prioritise them;
- ◆ discuss and agree the current core workstreams for further development.

It was proposed that the session be facilitated by an external facilitator.

#### **RESOLVED:**

Members of the Joint Committee to attend a half day workshop to be organised for September 2010.

#### **6. UPDATE FROM SURREY POLICE**

Chief Constable Mark Rowley was present at the meeting to provide the Committee with an update on the status of the Surrey First work from the Police perspective.

It was noted that, whilst the responsibilities and duties of the Police Force were clearly different to local authorities, the Police shared the overarching ambitions of Surrey First. From the Police perspective, the Chief Constable saw the greatest potential in the assets and IT workstreams. They were also interested in HR and Procurement, but would obviously have little involvement in the waste workstream.

#### **7. PARTNERSHIPS**

A list of existing partnerships/ joint working arrangements in Surrey was currently being drawn up. A draft extract was put before the Joint Committee.

It was agreed that an additional column be added to the spreadsheet to provide information on estimated savings. The Committee also agreed that it was important not limit the exercise to Surrey but to also take account of other partnership arrangements in bordering authorities.

#### **RESOLVED:**

That an additional column be added to the spreadsheet to provide information on estimated savings.

The list of partnerships to be tabled at the next meeting.

## 8. PROGRESS REPORTS

**Core Workstreams:** A report detailing progress on each of the five core workstreams was put before the Committee.

The Committee asked that the spend data be updated and included on the spreadsheet for the next meeting. It was also agreed that the timeline would be continued and tabled at each meeting to keep the Committee informed.

**Assets Workstream:** The Joint Committee received an update on the work taking place under the assets workstream. All partners had participated in the data gathering process, and the next stage was a series of workshops within each authority planned for September/ October 2010.

The Committee asked that the collated data be presented to all authorities, and not just made available to the authority to which it applies.

It was noted that there was a need for definite deadlines to be put in place to give the Committee an idea of timescales and to ensure that the workstream progresses quickly. However, Members also agreed that pushing for quick wins would be likely to result in the project failing. It was thought important that each stage was completed thoroughly in order to build confidence and ensure that the objectives could be realised.

The Committee recognised that significant savings could be realised if the Police were to co-locate in council run buildings. Mr Williams agreed that the number of properties currently held by the Police could be reduced to save money. However, he stated that the Police Authority had given an undertaking to the public that they would not move and Police Officers until another suitable building had been identified. This could not be done overnight but had the potential to generate significant savings so was worth waiting for.

In reference to section 7.1 of the report, it was noted that MACE was a firm of consultants that Surrey County Council was using on asset utilisation.

**HR:** The Committee received a progress update on the HR workstream and a Project Initiation Document to outline the objectives. Work was underway on joint workforce planning and the development of a single Surrey HR policy. The aim was to provide each authority with a detailed workforce profile by the end of August 2010. This information would equip them to take decisions in the lead up to budget setting in February 2011. It was agreed that a time frame and deadlines for taking the workstream forward should be set once data gathering and work force profiling was complete at the end of August.

It was noted that Midland Trent was an HR support software system to monitor staff sickness, holidays etc. The major advantage of the Midland Trent software was that it was web-based. Epsom & Ewell and Tandridge were already sharing this software.

The Committee agreed that the workstream should focus on joint working between the thirteen Surrey partners at this stage. It was thought important to keep an eye on what is going on elsewhere but not to slow progress down by trying to join widen the partnerships to outside Surrey at this stage.

The Committee asked for an indication of the cashable savings achieved/ projected for the existing joint working projects detailed in paragraph 3.1 of the report. It was also agreed that it would be beneficial to include information on which authorities were and were not involved in each project and for what reason.

It was noted that the key risks outlined in the PID were project resource and trade union and staff processes. The ability to mitigate these risks was really dependant on the buy-in and support from individual authorities.

**ICT:** The Committee received a progress update on the HR workstream and a Project Initiation Document to outline the objectives. It was noted that all twelve Surrey Councils, the Police, and NHS Surrey were now involved in the Surrey Chief Information Technology Officers Group (SCITO). This Group was supporting the Surrey First ICT workstream. The report outlined the key projects taking place under the workstream, including the Surrey Shared Data Centre and the Surrey Consortium Agreement (legal agreement to enable the shared procurement of ICT systems and services).

The Committee agreed that the centralisation of decision making outlined under paragraph 7.7 of the report was very important. SCITO was currently developing the governance arrangements to enable this. It was agreed that details should be circulated to the Joint Committee.

**RESOLVED:**

- (i) that spend data to be updated and included on the workstream monitoring spreadsheet for the next meeting;
- (ii) the timeline to be continued and tabled at each meeting;
- (iii) details of the governance arrangements for the ICT workstream to be circulated to the Joint Committee.

**9. EXTERNAL FUNDING**

The Committee received a paper to propose that a Surrey wide external funding unit be established with the aim of securing additional sources of income and better budget settlements across Surrey.

It was noted that Surrey County Council already had an office that carried out this function. However, it was County Council orientated and the boroughs/districts did not benefit.

Whilst it was felt that there was little opportunity for securing additional funding, it was agreed that there was a high chance that money would be diverted to other areas of the Country unless Surrey actively spoke out.

**RESOLVED:**

- (i) That contact to be made with the funding office at Surrey County Council to discuss the possibility of moving this forward;
- (ii) A more detailed paper to be brought back to the next meeting of the Joint Committee.

The meeting commenced at 10:00 AM and ended at 12.15 PM

Chairman: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_