



Minutes

ENVIRONMENT, TRANSPORT AND LOCALITY SERVICES SELECT COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF THE ENVIRONMENT, TRANSPORT AND LOCALITY SERVICES SELECT COMMITTEE HELD ON TUESDAY 8 APRIL 2014, IN MEZZANINE ROOM 2, COUNTY HALL, AYLESBURY, COMMENCING AT 10.00 AM AND CONCLUDING AT 12.00 PM.

MEMBERS PRESENT

Mr W Bendyshe-Brown, Mr T Butcher, Mr D Carroll (Vice-Chairman), Mr P Gomm, Mr S Lambert and Mr W Whyte (Chairman)

OTHERS IN ATTENDANCE

Mrs L Clarke OBE, Ms N Glover, Ms S Griffin (Secretary), Mr D Jones, Ms J King, Mr M Phillips, Mr D Sutherland, Rachel Toresen and Ms K Wager

1 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE / CHANGES IN MEMBERSHIP

Apologies for absence were received from Bill Chapple and Dev Dhillon.

2 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

3 MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on the Wednesday 4 March 2014 were agreed as a correct record subsequent to the following changes;

Community Transport Schemes in Bucks
Page 13 – Leader to be amended to LEADER

Matters Arising
See attached document



INVESTOR IN PEOPLE



4 PUBLIC QUESTIONS

There were no public questions.

5 CHAIRMAN'S REPORT

The Chairman reported the following;

A working group of the Environment, Transport & Localities Select Committee met to develop the scope of the review of public transport.

He had recently attended a Parliamentary seminar on Scrutiny which a very informative session. Discussions took place with other scrutiny chairman from around the country and how they approach scrutiny. Some sessions with the Parliamentary Scrutiny Committee related to the Department of Communities and Local Government, which touches on some of the work being carried out by this Committee. The Committee clerk gave some very useful information on how they structure their sessions and how they deal with evasive answers from Ministers and senior members of staff. There was also the opportunity to see a meeting of the DCLG Select Committee on Financial Devolution to Regions. A summary of key points to be circulated to Committee Members.

Action: Chairman

Value for Money – TfB for Bucks Contract

The report of the ETL Select Committee went to Cabinet in January. It was disappointing to learn that the Value for Money review has not commenced. It is hoped there will be an interim update in May with a view to reporting back in June on Value for Money review. The Value for Money contract will commence after TfB have completed their own internal audit.

Key Performance Indicators (KPIs)

KPIs were another issue of the TfB review. Some useful meetings to discuss KPIs took place before Christmas. A further meeting has taken place since the ETL Select Committee meeting in March, with another meeting due at the end of April. One useful development is the improvement of the transparency in how the KPIs are developed with members, officers and the contractor.

EU & external funding for transport issues

A further meeting took at the end of April. The ELT Committee agreed to keep the Local Enterprise Partnerships in mind during discussions.

Input is being given into the annual report for all of the Select Committees to advise work that has been undertaken during the last year.

6 LIBRARY SERVICES IN BUCKINGHAMSHIRE

The Chairman welcomed Martin Phillips, Cabinet Member for Community Engagement, David Jones, Service Delivery Manager, Julia King, Development Manager, to the meeting.

An information paper was circulated with the agenda.

The following questions were asked;

The report sets the position and current situations for the Library Services following recent changes. What is the County Council's long term vision and aspiration for future of the Library Services for the next 5-10 years and are there plans in place for this? Mr Phillips explained that the library service is currently going through a 4-5 year transformation

which has just passed the halfway point. The management structure was looked at a couple of years ago, followed by the community libraries and how library services were delivered in Bucks. One of the commitments made was made not to close any libraries unless the community did not want them.

There has been a review of the mobile library services in Buckinghamshire to see how this can be delivered more effectively. This includes the use of community shops and pubs etc within the smaller villages and hamlets of Buckinghamshire i.e. an order of books being delivered by a small van to a shop/pub which would be a better use of resources. The next part of the review is to look at the retained library service to see how the number of volunteers can be increased whilst maintaining a professional staff.

There has been a change in the way that libraries are used which the County Council has to react to i.e. the move to increased self-service and check in/check out of books, better IT resources and the sharing of library buildings with other services. There are a couple of libraries in Buckinghamshire where the police force is sharing the facility. Health checks have taken place in Libraries. The Health and Wellbeing Team have used 26 locations and health checked 1825 people. 3 locations were BCC libraries at which 835 residents were seen. This equates to 46% of those seen in the 26 locations.

What is the succinct vision/concept for Library Services? The succinct vision is reacting to the market and making better use of the buildings in the next 5-10 years.

To what extent it is feasible to roll out the community library service even further i.e. using other community buildings and what are the opportunities and risks for this model of delivery? Mr Jones explained that points 1-6 in the report give an analogy of model - looking at county and community as a complimentary partnership. At the moment there is a very clear relationship of the support given in the county which in turn influences the success of the community. The scaled up of a model is i.e. in the biggest and busiest community partnerships in Wendover and Gerrards Cross, begs the question of whether the dynamic in terms of the number of volunteers, the range, volume and complexity of the transactions would be successful. The plan at the moment in terms of future savings is to invest in self-service technology, to continue to ensure that the county can adequately support the community but also to use volunteers in an added value context and continue to generate efficiencies.

Working with other partners, how can the Authority get the best use of the facilities and services? Mr Jones referred members to section 8 of the report which describes the variety of agendas that the county library service can contribute to i.e. digital inclusion, Health and Wellbeing, employment skills and particular areas of importance and attraction for elderly people. We need to remember that with Community Library partnerships, there is a transaction or contract of sorts about liaison with the council to support the delivery of a service to reduce greater cost. This goes hand in hand with greater freedoms that the community can then use to shape and define that library in line with their needs. This is slightly at odds with a co-ordinated, high quality, skilled approach which allows the county council to contribute to some of those agendas. The county offer is starting to be defined now in terms of those agendas. Mr Phillips added that another area of partnership being looked into is that similar to the business hub in Chesham – the provision of a conferencing within the library for businesses in the Chiltern area as well as a free meeting room and office space for hot desking. It is hoped that this model will be rolled out across the county.

How much work has taken place to look at opportunities to develop and share premises with local businesses to run a community library? Mr Phillips explained that talks have taken place with the police and other groups and they also have the need to save money. The County Council and organisations can work together to make these joint savings.

Mr Jones added that during work to implement the community library partnerships, there was a very high profile consultation which in turn provoked a lot of interest, in particular from Thames Valley Police. There are some existing partnerships for example children's services. However; a concerted proactive approach in terms of targeting particular agencies has not been rolled

out. In some respects, there is almost an abundance of opportunities. Over the last five years the Council has reacted to significant financial challenges and a lot of time and effort has been invested in delivering a new model. Work needs to take place to look at the contribution the Council would most like to see and what that might be in terms of the role out of the business, business hubs in libraries and using these as the face of the Council to co-locate other services, drive down costs and bring the Council closer to the community. At the moment it is felt that this is where there is no clear direction of travel.

The national trend for public libraries since 2006 is visits to libraries and book borrowing nationally has dropped. The challenge is for public libraries to consider services and to look at where else they can bring value and make the effective contribution to the overall priorities of the Council. The final section of the report (section 11) gives a number of scenarios and the direction of travel.

Page 16 of the report outlines what the key facts and trends were in 2013/14. The Committee asked if there were some figures available to put these into context. Has this information been prepared for the meeting today? Mr Jones explained that figures are available. The guide for the members induction 2013 which includes 2012/13 data can be circulated to Committee Members.

Action: Mr Jones

The headlines for the key facts in the report are;

Physical visits – the estimate for 2013/14 is 1.7 million, last year 12/13 1703.

The most recent national trend data from the Chartered Institute of Professional Financial Accountants (CIPFA) shows;

12/13 shows the national trend in terms of number of visits reduced by 6%; book issues are down by 5% (the national trend is 9%); active members reduced by 5% (national trend data 9%); new members up by 18% to 18,500 members (14,675 in 2012/13). This could be related to the pricing strategy for IT usage. The first hour of IT usage is now free for members of the library. The number of visits to libraries catalogue page are static; access to online reference materials – the figures are slightly down; online issues i.e. e-books – an increase of 168%; public computer sessions - an increase of 28%.

Nationally there is an increase of 88% in the use of e-books. These statistics tell of a new and emerging market that public library services are beginning to respond to. Although only 3% of the overall issues are library stock; nevertheless these are exponentially increasing at a very sharp rate.

The level of the report is commended. How is the level of public satisfaction of the library service monitored/measured i.e. regular surveys, public awareness sessions etc.

Mr Jones explained that library services tended to conduct a standard customer survey every four years which has been rolled out nationally and allows comparative data to be pulled together for all library services nationally. The requirement from the current Government to produce this data has changed. Many library services now no longer carry out this survey. Buckinghamshire County Council plan in the year ahead to continue to carry out informal surveys but a comprehensive county wide survey has not been rolled out for several years. In the previous year a survey for computer users was carried out to find out what they were using the computers for and if they were happy with the offer being provided. There is an informal customer comment and complaint procedure in place as well as a focus from managers and frontline staff to engage with customers informally in developing and improving the service. There is the need to roll out a countywide customer services survey which is planned in the year ahead. The results of the survey can be reported to the Committee.

Action: David Jones

Is there engagement with those who run the community libraries to ask what is being done well, what is being done badly and what could be done better and regular forum to communicate and liaise? Mr Jones explained that regular review meetings take place with all of the community libraries. A member of staff has specifically been recruited as part of the community library strategy to offer a supporting role particularly in terms of training. Each

county library has a role in terms of informal buddying support to ensure the community libraries have clear information in terms of first points of contact and resources available for training. There is member of staff within the Information Services team who visits community libraries to deliver sessions on 24 hour on line resources and e-books etc. A children's co-ordinator goes to each community library to invite and involve them in our summer reading challenge. Library services that previously felt challenged by the community libraries have a renewed and revised approach to supporting community libraries and are now vocal champions of the service.

Has a Committee been set up to act as governance for community libraries and what parameters do community libraries operate within?

Mr Phillips explained that the Community Library has a Committee and a group of volunteers. Mr Jones added that there is a Resource Grant arrangement in place whereby the County Council seeks to support and direct but not control, to include but not to coerce. This has been quite a challenge for the County Council in terms of a cultural shift of staff etc as this is quite a new model. There is no precedent nationally in terms of what has been done. Self-managed community libraries are invariably 'not for profit' organisations constituted as charities. They have their own internal governance. The Resources Grant Agreement will require transparency and equity. The County Council concern is that the organisation should be an inclusive and fair organisation. For models where there are a number of different reasons where formal lease arrangements or Resource Grant Arrangements have not been entered into, there are Partnership agreements which define the clear roles and responsibilities.

Does the County Council insist that community libraries must be a charity so there is a public record of finances and trustees? Before taking forward the report for a Cabinet Member decision, all of the Committees were required to submit a business plan. BCC does not insist that a Community Library constitutes as a charity but invariably all of them have elected to be a 'not for profit' organisation in one form or another.

How is the co-location with other services working and is there governance in place? Mr Jones explained that governance arrangements take place through the lease which makes a provision for co-location. In Haddenham the community library is co-located with a children's centre and in Great Missenden, Thames Valley Police. With the children's centres, a demised space is created through the lease. A lease is entered into with the Community library for the building with the exception of the area used for children's services. This area would be a separate lease.

The community library and business hub in Chesham are mentioned in the report. Is this model going to be rolled out and are the services financially viable? Julia King explained that Chesham Hub is run in partnership with Bucks Business First and they have the model already operating in Saunderton. As part of the work the County Council does with BBF in terms of them signpost their members to the library for some of our professional business resource, the dialogue started from their desire to operate hubs outside Saunderton. As part of the work being done with Chesham partnership to bring different bodies to work together, Chesham seemed to be the key starting place for libraries to work with Bucks Business First. They are keen to look at other areas i.e. in the North of the county. The library service will take this forward with BBF to see if the Chesham hub can be replicated in a library in the north of the county i.e. Buckingham library

Future challenges have been mentioned in the report but not how savings will be delivered. The report refers to an increased income of only £10,000 per year which does not seem a huge amount. Is there more scope to increase income? Self-service organisational change savings of £450,000 are also referred to in the report. Are these figures realistic; does this pose a threat to the service or is it an opportunity to improve the service. Mr Jones explained that the report summarises the last four years in terms of £1m. The County Council is very proud of the track record as there has not been a reduction

in opening hours and no libraries have been closed. Eight of the community libraries have increased their opening hours and over £1m of savings has been generated year on year in terms of net expenditure by remodelling.

There is the further challenge of saving another £500,000 in the next three years. A period of formal staff consultancy on proposals for organisational change will begin on the 29 April 2014. This will be the stretching of the management span of the county structure and the de-layering of the management structure for the county library. It should be possible to deliver in the region of £200,000/£300,000 savings though by necessity having a bold approach to the transformation of the management structure. It is hoped that more flexible, more casual staffing arrangements will be introduced in the following years. Section 11 of the report refers to future shape/governance. Having plans in place for another £500,000 of savings, the library service might need to consider either new governance arrangements such as a staff mutual, a trust or a co-operative approach or the County Council may want to consider a network of community venues which could be the core around which other County Council services are co-located.

This is a very good opportunity to use libraries and other premises owned by Bucks County Council as hubs around which other Council services can be clustered, bringing the Council closer to the Community. Mr Phillips said that in the North of the County one option being considered is retraining/reskilling library staff to act as a 'contact point' in those areas.

Mr Jones referred to the national trend which is a year on year decline in the number of library book borrowing and physical visits, libraries attract a huge emotional, social and community support which can sometimes be out of proportion to the level of use the service. A way of continuing to deliver the traditional services that are very popular needs to be found i.e. co-locating could represent a way forward in terms of sustainable library services.

The Chairman thanked the presenters for explaining the report and for their response to the variety of questions and the very useful discussion.

Comments made by the Committee

- There is a lack of clarity of the vision and commitment for the future plan in terms of what the library services is, and could be and the governance process.
- An understanding of how the financial challenges are being used to drive a vision for the new library
- An understanding of the overriding strategy of the transition to a new library service

The Committee agreed the following;

1. The Cabinet Member/Service Area design and plan a long term strategy and vision for the future of library services, including more of a strategy on how budget changes will be dealt with.
2. Develop more defined objectives over how the council library services can work in partnership with other organisations (e.g. co-location opportunities/community hubs) and proactively pursuing opportunities in a coordinated way.
3. Provide the committee with an update in 6 months on the longer term plan for the future of library services over the next 5 years and incorporating the points above.

Lesley Clarke, OBE, Cabinet Member for Planning & Environment, Netta Glover, Deputy Cabinet Member for Planning & Environment, David Sutherland, Sustainability Manager & Rachel Toresen-Owuor, Energy Manager were welcomed to the meeting.

The Cabinet Member explained that Buckinghamshire County Council has been looking at its energy consumption, for buildings in particular. Savings are beginning to be made and water consumption is now being looked into for the first time. The consumption figures can be presented to the Committee if required.

In response to the question about fracking raised in the letter dated 4 February, Lester Hannington, Lead Officer for Waste and Minerals Planning has compiled a document entitled 'frequently asked FAQ's concerning on-shore oil and gas development which is on the BCC website. The Government is about to issue the 14th licensing round for fracking. Buckinghamshire County Council will look into fracking once the details of where the licences are going to be given are known. The Minerals and Waste Strategy will also be updated. Details can be found via the following web link;
<http://www.buckscc.gov.uk/media/1789957/Buckinghamshire-Fracking-FAQs-note.pdf>

We may have fracking in Buckinghamshire but the county does not have the right shale clay that is easily used. There is one license at the moment for exploration around Windsor Castle which ends this year. Fracking has not started in this area as yet. BCC are well aware of having to ensure that that energy efficiency projects are started.

Ms Toresen-Owuor outlined the following salient points of the report;

The Carbon Management Programme and the Energy Strategy are two different strands of work but they will come together as BCC move towards Future Shape as a transformation plan for energy in Buckinghamshire.

Carbon Management Programme (CMP) looks at energy consumption and

- BCC is focussing on its own estate and energy consumption (including schools). This is primarily energy efficiency projects, with some renewables (biomass boiler programme).
- The Plan will help the Council to achieve a 10% absolute reduction in CO₂ by April 2017 compared to 2011/12 emissions
- BCC are a mandated participant in Phase 1 of the Carbon Reduction Commitment (CRC) Energy Efficiency Scheme, which requires reporting of energy consumption and purchase of allowances for CO₂ emissions. Phase 1 of the scheme ends in July 2014.
- Reporting on carbon reduction and the Greenhouse Gas to the Department of Energy and Climate Change (DECC). This is not statutory but all Local Authorities are expected to report.
- Reports to Carbon Management Board, Property Board and COMT.
- Invest to Save projects funded using Salix ringfenced fund, MTP capital bids, corporate energy efficiency reserve.
- Upgrade the street lights to LED lamps on the A & B roads and the installation of a biomass boiler this summer

The Energy Strategy looks at what measures Buckinghamshire can take as a county and includes;

- A countywide strategy, developed in partnership with District Councils and stakeholders.
- Focussing on opportunities for community owned energy generation projects, and overcoming barriers to implementation of energy schemes.
- Aims to increase long term energy security and local supplier competition and secure economic social benefit to the residents and businesses in Buckinghamshire.
- Governed by NEP, with LEP interface for securing funding.

The two strands of work run in parallel to transform the way the energy usage is looked at across Buckinghamshire with the overarching vision of becoming much more energy resilient and that the communities will benefit.

During the update the following questions were asked;

Is it possible to clarify the statutory obligations the County Council is under in terms of its Carbon Management Plan and Energy Strategy? Ms Toresen-Owuor explained that the Authority is a mandatory participant of phase 1 of the Carbon Reduction Commitment Energy Efficiency scheme which ends in July. Participation is mandated by law under the Climate Change Act 2008 to report our energy consumption to Government and to purchase allowances for the carbon emissions as a result of that energy consumption. The CMB plan is not mandatory; however it makes good business sense as increasing the energy efficiency of the property portfolio and operations saves money. The Authority is not mandated to set targets or develop an energy strategy but is exploring the potential for income generation i.e. solar and wind power and bio mass installation. There is also the opportunity to generate income by looking at the potential to setting up as an Energy Services/Supply Company.

The report makes reference to the Carbon Management Board and the Property Board. Is it possible to have further information on who sits on each of the Boards and their Terms of Reference? Ms Toresen-Owuor advised that that Terms of Reference for the Carbon Management Board (CMB) have just been reviewed the Terms of Reference. The CMB is chaired by Lesley Clarke and supported by Netta Glover. The Board has representation from all service areas across the Authority (Place, Transport for Buckinghamshire, Adults and Family Wellbeing etc). The TOR and Membership list can be circulated to Committee Members.

Action: Ms Toresen-Owuor

What anticipated barriers are seen for the implementation of the energy schemes i.e. the lack of renewable spaces in the county? The Cabinet Member explained that energy consumption as a whole needs to be looked into in greater detail. There are many of ways to increase how things are being done at the moment. One possibility BCC is considering is setting up its own Local Authority Trading Company. A visit has been arranged to a community solar/wind farm in Wiltshire.

Are there any anticipated barriers in terms of thought processes, rules, regulations or other bodies? The Cabinet Member said it is about knowledge, knowing who to contact and where financial assistance/ grants can be levered in from. Page 58 gives details of the various renewable energy projects being looked at i.e. bio mass. Talks have taken place with the National Trust as they run a bio-mass facility in Hughenden (Chiltern Woodlands Business) as well as using other areas in the portfolio i.e. wood from parks and the land. There is the need to look at the way things can be done differently.

Mr Sutherland explained that as a county, Buckinghamshire generates 3% of its energy from renewable sources. From an energy resilience point of view, Buckinghamshire is very open to market volatility in terms of prices rises. There is a shift in market appetite around how do things differently. The Authority has looked at own estate first. The agricultural estate is being looked at in terms of how it can generate energy itself i.e. the installation of a bio-mass boiler in Black Park in the summer and using the wood from the estate to become self sufficient in heat.

70% of the housing stock in Buckinghamshire is poorly insulated. In terms of planning, there is the need to ensure that a carbon footprint reduction is built into the planning and approval of all new housing stock.

What projects is the Energy Strategy focussing on? Ms Toresen-Owuor advised that an activity register for the Energy Strategy has yet to be developed. A fact finding visit to Westmill Solar Park, Wiltshire is taking place at the end of April.

The Cabinet Member added that BCC would like to start to become perhaps an energy company to provide cheaper energy to residents of Buckinghamshire. There are lots of buildings where solar panels could be installed, Photovoltaic (PV) noise barriers alongside motorways could be looked at as well as the Energy for Waste plant and the benefits that could be obtained from this. There are a lot of measures which could be taken where a reduction in income and the carbon footprint could be seen.

Ms Toresen-Owuor reported that she had recently attended the Carbon Trust Public Sector Conference and BCC received an award in recognition of being a leading public sector organisation participating in terms of tackling carbon.

Mr Sutherland explained that when the bio-mass boilers are installed, the Authority will be selling heat as part of the programme and will also be generating an annual income of about £180,000 from the Renewable Heat Incentive. With regard to schools, in the last year as part of the CMP energy efficiency projects were prioritised. Across the education portfolio a two year insulation programme in local schools has just been completed. This should generate savings of around £140,000 per year.

A new primary school is being built in Buckingham through S106. What steps will be taken to ensure that the school meets the energy new requirements? When BCC commissioning new buildings, are they demanding what is expected of existing stock?

The Cabinet Member explained that planning rules and regulations state a certain standard.

Mr Sutherland added that in the Sustainability Action Plan that went to Cabinet in March 2013, the aspiration was for new builds to be BREAM 'very good' standard.

What are the risks of setting up an Energy Service company, how it is proposed this will be done and what is the strategy.

The Deputy Cabinet Member explained that BCC are currently investigating the possibility of setting up an energy company. Bio-mass issues are being looked at i.e. Black Park hoping to become energy efficient. The Authority is starting to look where it can bring in income. One way is making sure that businesses, schools and the Authority's own buildings are energy efficient. District Councils have the opportunity of cavity wall filling and loft insulation but there are issues with helping residents to empty their loft. How this issue can be overcome needs to be looked into.

There should be caution about setting up an energy company as EfW may not generate enough money to subsidise someone else's fuel.

Mr Sutherland explained that all the projects under the CMP are looked at as part of a business case in terms of are they driving savings for the Authority. When the baseline figure was put together in 2011/2012, it was calculated that about £11m was being spent on energy across the property portfolio. If no action was taken, this would rise to about £18m by 2017. The biomass boilers being installed this summer will generate around £180,000 per annum in renewable heat incentive for the Authority.

The work being done is commended. How does the County Council promote and communicate with residents to get their buy-in into the energy schemes?

Mr Sutherland explained that the Authority runs a Community Energy Champion scheme where volunteers from the community are trained in energy i.e. the use of heat guns with the idea of them being champions in their community regarding energy. The scheme has been very successful from a small start. More than 60 volunteers have been trained to use and promote energy schemes and equipment.

Ms Toresen-Owuor added that Community Energy Champions scheme was initially funded using the Big Society funding. The three year funding programme is now coming to an end. With regard to engagement in the Energy Strategy, at the workshop held in February for

stakeholders, there were representatives from active community groups i.e. the Low Carbons Chilterns Co-operative and Save Aylesbury Vale's Environment who would cascade information. The Community Energy Champions are also able to help other members of the community understand their own energy bills. A lot of effort is put into good links which focus on energy efficiency.

Is there information about the Community Energy Champions Scheme on the BCC website? Ms Toresen-Owuor said the BCC webpage is currently being updated to include pictures and case studies of the energy projects.

The Energy Strategy is not on the website at the moment. The next drafting session for the Energy Strategy is in May. It is hoped that a version of the Energy Strategy will be ready for public consultation in June.

What is the Natural Environment Partnership (NEP), what is BCC's role with the NEP, and what is the relationship between the NEP and the Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP)? The Deputy Cabinet Member explained that the NEP looks after environment matters with other agencies and is run by Bucks Business First from offices in Saunderton. The NEP has recently lost Partnership Manager. Vicky Wetherall has been appointed as the interim Partnership Manager and is currently working on a business/community plan and State of Play report as well as priorities and funding sources. There is also the need to explore how the NEP and LEP liaise in terms of funding possibilities. Various District Councils contribute £4,000 and the Local Authority has contributed £25,000 towards the running of the LEP. The official launch of the NEP and an analysis of what has happened in the first year have been delayed due to the Partnership Manager leaving the organisation. There is a meeting next week to discuss the future of the NEP.

Mr Sutherland added that the NEP originated from the Department of Environment, Food and Agriculture network of Local Nature Partnerships to bring together organisations in the county who have an interest in the environment under one governance body and to take forward any issues on the natural environment in a collegiate view.

The report from the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change and the effects on Local Government needs to be looked at as part of the Committee Work Programme. Mr Sutherland explained that work has taken place in terms of looking at the risk to Council Services and how they can adapt to extreme weather and climate change.

The Chairman said it would be good if the Bernwood Forest concept became part of an energy reduction scheme in terms of new woodland.

Ms Toresen-Owuor reported that a discussion has taken place with David Green on the potential for the Bernwood Forest zone and the possibility of prioritising the agricultural estate in that area.

The Cabinet Member invited Members of the ETL Committee to be involved in the development of the Energy Company.

The Chairman thanked the presenters for their very informative update.

8 COMMITTEE WORK / ITEM PROPOSALS

Members were referred to the following;

Public transport inquiry

The Committee Inquiry Draft Proposal paper examines what is the Council's aspiration for public transport in Bucks for 2010 (page 93 of the agenda). The proposal gives details of the task and scope of the inquiry which has been broken down into the following three stages;

Stage one

To identify, examine and review the Council's current policies, transports landscape, budget allocation and funding challenges in relation to public transport

Stage two

To understand what the future of public transport may/should look like. This stage could begin by exploring and identifying what the future needs and demands are likely to be, examine the options available, and the options available for the use of transport funding to meet the needs of Bucks residents. This could also consider the wider impacts of the county's growth and connectivity and the interplay or not of other reviews.

Stage three

Findings and recommendations

Following discussion, the Committee agreed the following;

- Home to School Transport is to be included in stage one of the inquiry
- Evidence sessions are to be set up over 1-2 days in June/July to include witnesses and the Committee. Meeting dates are to be confirmed.

Action: Kama Wager

Crime and Disorder Committee remit and relationship with the Police and Crime Panel

The Committee information and Proposal Paper outlines the role of the Environment, Transport and Locality Services Select Committee as the designated statutory Crime and Disorder Committee and consider the relationship between the Committee and the Police and Crime Panel.

Mr Gomm declared an interest as he is Chairman of Crime Stoppers.

Mr Carroll declared an interest as he is the Assistant Police and Crime Commissioner for Thames Valley Police Authority.

Concern was expressed that various acts of Parliament were enacted at different times i.e. the 2006 Act was before the advent of the Police and Crime Commissioner.

The following comments were made and questions asked;

- The ETL Select Committee should only fulfil their statutory obligation.
- What is the membership of the partnerships shown on in the chart on page 100?
- There is a distinct difference between policing and Community Safety. There needs to be a better understanding of how the County Council works in relation with the District Council in Community Safety Partnerships

The Policy Officer explained that the statutory obligation of the ETL Committee is to review and scrutinise the County's Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership (the Safer and Stronger Bucks Partnership) and the work of the Partnership as a whole.

The Committee agreed that they would meet as the Crime and Disorder Committee at the 13 May Environment Select Committee meeting. The ET: Committee will receive the annual statutory update and review the Safer and Strong Bucks Plan (the Council's Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership).

Members noted the Daws Hill Travel Link – Consultation Material paper which has been submitted for information.

10 COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMME

Members were referred to the proposed work programme for the Committee.

The Policy Officer advised that the 2014/2015 work programme will be available after the AGM. Key issues/items have been requested from Cabinet Members and Service Directors and Strategic Directors of portfolios that fall within the remit of the Environment Select Committee which will allow for longer term planning of the work programme. This will be confirmed at the May meeting of the Committee.

Action: Policy Officer

11 DATE OF THE NEXT MEETING

The next meeting is due to take place on Tuesday 13 May 2014 in Mezzanine 2, County Offices, Aylesbury at 10.00am. There will be a pre-meeting for Committee Members at 9.30am.

Future meeting dates for 2014

Tuesday 17 June

Tuesday 2 September

Tuesday 14 October

Tuesday 18 November

CHAIRMAN

ETL - Action Update from 4th March Committee

Green Deal Actions – Alexandra Day:

The details of those who are prepared to pay or borrow finance versus free delivery related to the market analysis of customers preferences are to be circulated to Committee Members.

Previous national energy efficiency schemes have involved free or heavily subsidised measures with instances of low uptake, therefore it is logical to question whether schemes like Green Deal, which are not ordinarily free or subsidised (Green Deal Cash Back is available until June 2014 and additional ECO funding is available to eligible householders and properties), will have any interest from consumers. It is important to recognise that Green Deal Together, the local authority-backed community interest company will offer whole house or single measure packages which can be financed in the number of ways; Green Deal finance is just one option. The following points are from a Consumer Focus report exploring the barriers to uptake of free or subsidised schemes and some consumer reaction to up-front or split payment schemes:

- Free measures remove the barrier of upfront cost completely for consumers with a primary finance motivation
- Promoting an entirely or partially free scheme can lead to challenges
- Free schemes can raise suspicion; “there must be a catch” attitude
- It may lead people to devalue measures and assume that it is something not worth paying for which in turn lowers up take
- DECC’s research on consumer attitudes showed that 33% of people had a preference to pay the cost up front

Green Deal Together will be looking at the recommendations from this report and others research to inform the consumer offer and marketing.

Source: What’s in it for me? – Using the benefits of energy efficiency to overcome the barriers, Consumer Focus June 2012

<http://www.consumerfocus.org.uk/files/2012/06/Whats-in-it-for-me-IA.pdf>

The list of measures that the consumer can get under the Green Deal is to be circulated to Committee Members.

A Green Deal Assessor explains the measures suitable for a householder based on the property and how the occupants use energy. The Assessor will run calculations to indicate modest estimate of energy savings per measures and whether Green Deal finance is available for the package of measures that are suitable for that particular householder. The list below summarises the measures available to householders;

Heating measures:

- Condensing boiler (gas or oil)
- Fan-assisted storage heater
- Flue gas heat recovery device
- Heating controls (e.g. remotely controllable thermostats, zone controls, smart radiators valves)

- Warm-air unit
- Hot water measures:
- Hot water cylinder jacket
- Cylinder thermostat
- Waste water heat recovery devices for showers

Insulation measures:

- Cavity wall insulation
- Solid wall insulation
- Draught proofing
- Loft or roof insulation
- Room in roof insulation
- Under-floor insulation

Windows and doors:

- Replacement glazing
- Secondary glazing
- High performance external doors

Micro-generation and renewables:

- Air source heat pumps
- Biomass boilers and heaters
- Ground source heat pumps
- Micro wind generation
- Micro Combined Heat and Power (CHP)
- Water source heat pumps
- Solar water heating
- Solar Photovoltaics

Source: Gov.uk – Green Deal <https://www.gov.uk/green-deal-energy-saving-measures>

Update on the financials and background information on the decision to set up the Green Deal Together Community Interest Company.

All details are in the [Cabinet Report on Green Deal Community Interest Company](#).

Local Enterprise Partnerships – Stephen Walford:

An update on the list of schemes that the LTB prioritised to be circulated to committee members.

<http://democracy.buckscc.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=786&MId=5658&Ver=4>

An update on Local Enterprise Partnerships has been added to the Work Programme for October.

Community Transport

Angie Sarchet: Members invited to attend a co- design workshop to review and plan community transport from a multi-agency perspective. **Update:** Date to be confirmed.

What is the Maximum amount of funding that can be applied for from the community transport challenge fund AND can applications still be made for LEADER (EU) funding?

- The maximum amount for the Challenge fund is £30K but at a recent meeting the panel now have discretion on projects if they fall above or below the threshold limit; if they are considered good schemes.
- The LEADER fund in theory could have been used as match funding; however, LEADER have now allocated all of their money and they are saying that they will not be open for any new funding until January 2015, so in reality that source of funds is not an option.

An urgent update is needed on the contract in terms of negotiations and financial decisions - clarification of the funding streams - what it the Community Transport hub achieving and is it achieving value for money.

Andy Clarke (BCC): From my point of view the Hub fulfils a valuable function as it is the only way the public can access CT information but we will need to review the price based on current call volume.

Paul O'Hare: In regards to the transport hub, funding is in place until the end of June 2014. We have worked out internally at CIB that to keep the hub running as it is, and to include some more promotional work (because as discussed at the select committee, there are very few repeat calls because people are building a relationship with the scheme that they are referred to) it will costs £10k per year to run. This is because the initial set up and ground work has been undertaken. In the current funding model, 50% is funded by BCC the other 50% is funded by the NHS. If the levels of calls remain the same then for a total cost of £10k the cost per call would be approximately £29. If we do a promotion push then we should expect more calls and therefore the cost per call would be lowered.

In regards to funding and discussions with the NHS, my service director, Diane Rutter, is pulling together a proposal and will be following up with the NHS soon on this, but no further dates have been set with them up until now. They have suggested that we go through their various charitable trusts to get this funded. Diane will also be following this up from a county perspective as well.

In answer to your overall comments (evaluation, monitoring, value for money); we are in the process of pulling together the quarterly report for Jan – Apr of the Hub.

The report is not ready yet but will forward through once it is. An evaluation of the whole project will take place during the next quarter (Apr – Jun) as this will be the last quarter of the hub. Discussions are expected to take place during the next three months, and from our perspective the value for money question should be looked at in relation to our quotation of ongoing costs for the hub. We have suggested £10k per year to keep it going (i.e. until end of June 2015) and is £10k value for money in the future, it is hard to quantify, but considering we are dealing with people at crisis point and/or the most vulnerable you could consider that it is. Also if we continue with 50/50 split of funding then the question for BCC would be is £5k value for money for the hub for next year, as that is the amount BCC would be contributing? I certainly don't see a situation where BCC will be contributing 100% of the costs of the hub, given the high proportion of health related calls.

The Cabinet Member for Transportation is to be contacted for a definitive answer.

Action: Kama Wager