

## HERTSMERE BOROUGH COUNCIL

Meeting name & Date	<b>EXECUTIVE</b> <b>25 July 2018</b>
Agenda item	<b>6.1</b>
Report title	<b>Report of Operations Review Committee – Physical Access Security Review</b>
Report reference no.	<b>EX/18/51</b>
Wards affected	All wards
Report author, job title & email	Councillors R Butler [Lead Member], Barker, Kelly and Merchant
List of Appendices	Appendix A – Report of the Scrutiny Review into Physical Access Security. Appendix B – Form for the Executive's response to the Scrutiny Review into Physical Access Security.
Portfolio Holder	Finance and Property - Councillor Graham
Reason for urgency	Not applicable

### **1 RECOMMENDATION**

- 1.1 To respond to the report and recommendations from the Operations Review Committee arising from its review of Physical Access Security.

### **2 PURPOSE OF THIS REPORT**

- 2.1 Operations Review Committee has carried out a review of the physical access arrangements within the Civic Offices. Its conclusions and recommendations are set out in its report, attached as Appendix A.
- 2.2 Section 122 of the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007 places a duty on the Executive to respond to recommendations from scrutiny committees within two months, indicating what action the Executive proposes to take. A form is attached at Appendix B for this response.

### **3 OFFICER FEEDBACK**

- 3.1 Relevant officers have considered the content of the Review report prior to its presentation to the Executive.
- 3.2 Officers' comments on the specific implications of implementing the Scrutiny Review's recommendations are detailed in section 4-12.
- 3.3 There was no general comment from Officers in relation to their service area.

**4 FINANCIAL AND BUDGET FRAMEWORK IMPLICATIONS**

4.1 There are no financial implications arising from this report.

**5 LEGAL POWERS RELIED ON AND ANY LEGAL IMPLICATIONS**

5.1 There are no legal implications arising from this report.

**6 EFFICIENCY GAINS AND VALUE FOR MONEY**

6.1 There are no implications arising from this report.

**7 RISK MANAGEMENT IMPLICATIONS**

7.1 There are no implications arising from this report.

**8 PERSONNEL IMPLICATIONS**

8.1 There are no implications arising from this report.

**9 EQUALITIES IMPLICATIONS**

9.1 There are no implications arising from this report.

**10 CORPORATE PLAN and POLICY FRAMEWORK IMPLICATIONS**

10.1 There are no implications arising from this report.

**11 ASSET MANAGEMENT IMPLICATIONS**

11.1 There are no implications arising from this report.

**12 HEALTH AND SAFETY IMPLICATIONS**

12.1 There are no implications arising from this report”

**13 BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS USED TO PREPARE THIS REPORT**

None.	
-------	--

**14 CONSULTATION ON DRAFT REPORT**

A draft of this report was sent to the following:

<b>Consultee</b>
Chief Executive & Corporate Director (COB)
Heads of Service
Health & Safety Officer

**APPENDIX A:  
Report of the Scrutiny Review into Physical Access Security.**

**SCRUTINY REVIEW INTO  
PHYSICAL ACCESS SECURITY**

**CONTENTS**

- 1 Foreword by the Scrutiny Review Councillors
- 2 Summary
- 3 Recommendations
- 4 Objective of the Scrutiny Review
- 5 Background
- 6 Conclusion

Timeline: 24 July 2018 Executive (EX/18/51)

## 1. Foreword

- 1.1 The Operations Review Committee would like to present their review into the issue of physical access security within the Civic Offices.
- 1.2 We undertook this review because Committee Members and Councillor colleagues generally had highlighted the difficulty they had in experienced in accessing the Civic Offices and Council Officers when conducting Council business.

### Scrutiny Review carried out by:



**Cllr R Butler**  
*Lead Member*



**Cllr Barker**



**Cllr Kelly**



**Cllr Merchant**

## 2. Summary

- 2.1 The Civic Offices is a public building which should be made to feel welcoming for all members of the public but also provide a safe place for all who work within the building. However disproportionate safety measures should not prevent Councillors from going about their Council business in an effective manner, as is currently the case.
- 2.2 The Executive is asked to consider our recommendations and ask the Chief Officer Board to take the necessary steps to implement our recommendations.

## 3. Recommendations

### The Operations Review Committee recommend to the Executive:

- 3.1 **That the door to the Group Rooms and Members Room from the Council Chamber should be secured to only allow access with a pass.**
- 3.2 **That the Deputy be given the same access level as the Opposition Group Leader so that they can carry out the Opposition role in the absence of their Leader.**
- 3.3 **That the following measures be put in place to ensure no Councillor abuses or misuses their access privileges:**

- a. **If a Councillor wants to visit an Officer regarding an issue that would take more than 10 minutes, then the Councillor must schedule the meeting in advance.**
- b. **No Councillor may walk a member of the public into Civic Offices areas apart from their relevant Group Room or a meeting room that has been booked. If this is not done that Councillor's access should be returned to the level currently in place for Members.**
- c. **Councillors' access should be increased from the current level to enable:**
  - i. **Drop-off and collection of iPads, forms etc.**
  - ii. **Access for Group Whips to drop off or sign Substitute Forms.**
  - iii. **Committee chairs to have access to departments that fall within their remit.**

## **4. Objective of the Scrutiny Review**

- 4.1 The objective was initially to look at a wide range of security from ICT to the physical environment. However Operations Review Committee decided this was too wide-ranging as it generated too large a volume of questions for Officer resources to process. Therefore the Committee refocused the review to only evaluate the physical aspects of security within the Civic Offices.
- 4.2 To meet our objective we asked Chief Officers the following questions:
  - What is the perceived threat?
  - What is the objective of the access and security provisions in the Civic Offices?
  - How is that objective being met?

## **5. Background**

- 5.1 We received the following response to our questions on access:

### **What is the perceived threat?**

- a. Unauthorised access to individual's records/information.
- b. Safety issues for Councillors, employees, users and tenants from aggrieved individuals.
- c. Breach of confidentiality of the council's data due to ease of access.
- d. Theft of council's assets such as computers as well as individual occupiers personal property.
- e. Acts of terrorism.
- f. Control zone in the event of an emergency evacuation.

## **What is the objective of the access and security provisions in the Civic Offices?**

- g. To ensure safety and security of Councillors, employees, users and tenants on the council premises as well as the personal property and assets belonging to the council and its occupiers.

### **How is that objective being met?**

- h. By restricting access and use of ID/touch security cards have ensured that only authorised individuals have access to relevant areas of the Civic Offices.
  - i. All visitors to the Civic Offices are recorded by Customer Services into the visitors record book which includes their arrival and departure times. In addition, visitors are escorted around the building for the duration of their visit at the Civic Offices.
  - h. To prevent unauthorised access to individual's records/information, IT systems are password protected and access to systems is restricted to those employees that need to use that system. Access to building is restricted by door entry system to protect paper records. These measures also reduce the chances of any breach of confidentiality.
  - i. Buildings are secure and have intruder alarms and door entry systems to prevent theft of council assets such as computers as well as individual occupier's personal property.
- 5.2 We considered the response to our questions. On the basis of the response given, we concluded that there was no reason why a Councillor would be more of a security threat or make a mistake with data protection than an Officer. Ultimately, the Civic Offices is a place of work for both Officers and Councillors, as such access arrangements must show parity.
- 5.3 Currently Executive Members and the Opposition Group Leader have full access to the Civic Offices in order to meet the requirements of their roles. This should be retained, with the addition that the Deputy Opposition Group Leader should have the same access as the Opposition Group Leader so that they can carry out the Opposition role in the absence of the Leader.
- 5.4 In terms of strengthening security around access, we noted that the door to the Group Rooms and Members Room from the Council Chamber should be secured to only allow access with a pass.
- 5.5 Whilst we wish access to be increased to Councillors, we would want the following measures be put in place to ensure no Councillor abuses or misuses their increased access privileges:
- a. If a Councillor wants to visit an Officer regarding an issue that would take more than 10 minutes, then the Councillor must schedule the meeting in advance.
  - b. No Councillor may walk a member of the public into Civic Offices areas apart from their relevant Group Room or a meeting room that has been booked. If this is not done that Councillor's access should be returned to the level currently in place for Members.

- c. Councillors' access should be increased from the current level to allow:
- Drop-off iPads, forms etc and collect such items from Officers.
  - Access for Group Whips drop off or sign Substitute Forms.
  - Committee chairs have access to the departments that fall within their remit.

## **6. Conclusion**

- 6.1 Councillors and Officers both have a role to play in the running of Hertsmere Council, and both must work in partnership to carry out their roles effectively. Limiting the access of one partner - without accounting for the needs of their role - weakens this partnership working. We hope our recommendations will assist Officers and Councillors to work easily together without reducing the safety and security of data and personnel.
- 6.2 The Operations Review Committee will review the effectiveness of the response to its recommendations in January 2019.

**Report produced by  
Councillors R Butler [Lead Member], Barker, Kelly and Merchant  
on behalf of Operations Review Committee, May 2018**

**APPENDIX B:**  
**Form for the Executive's response to the Scrutiny Review into Physical Access Security.**  
**Deadline for Executive's response to Operations Review Committee: 1 October 2018**

<b>Recommendation 1:</b>	That the door to the Group Rooms and Members Room from the Council Chamber should be secured to only allow access with a pass.
<b>Response:</b>	
<b>Completion Date:</b>	
<b>Lead officer:</b>	

<b>Recommendation 2:</b>	That the Deputy be given the same access level as the Opposition Group Leader so that they can carry out the Opposition role in the absence of their Leader.
<b>Response:</b>	
<b>Completion Date:</b>	
<b>Lead officer:</b>	

<b>Recommendation 3:</b>	That the following measures be put in place to ensure no Councillor abuses or misuses their access privileges: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. If a Councillor wants to visit an Officer regarding an issue that would take more than 10 minutes, then the Councillor must schedule the meeting in advance.</li> <li>b. No Councillor may walk a member of the public into Civic Offices areas apart from their relevant Group Room or a meeting room that has been booked. If this is not done that Councillor's access should be returned to the level currently in place for Members.</li> <li>c. Councillors' access should be increased from the current level to enable: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Drop-off and collection of iPads, forms etc.</li> <li>ii. Access for Group Whips to drop off or sign Substitute Forms.</li> <li>iii. Committee chairs to have access to departments that fall within their remit.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<b>Response:</b>	
<b>Completion Date:</b>	
<b>Lead officer:</b>	