



Buckinghamshire County Council
Select Committee
Environment, Transport and Locality Services

Minutes

ENVIRONMENT, TRANSPORT AND LOCALITY SERVICES SELECT COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF THE ENVIRONMENT, TRANSPORT AND LOCALITY SERVICES SELECT COMMITTEE HELD ON TUESDAY 18 NOVEMBER 2014, IN MEZZANINE ROOM 2, COUNTY HALL, AYLESBURY, COMMENCING AT 10.00 AM AND CONCLUDING AT 12.12 PM.

MEMBERS PRESENT

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

OTHERS IN ATTENDANCE

Ms S Griffin (Secretary), Mr P Hardy, Mr D Jones, Ms J King, Page, Mr M Phillips, Mr J Rippon and Ms K Wager

1 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Dev Dhillon.

2 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

The Chairman declared an interest in Item 6 – Library Services in Bucks as he is a Trustee for The Old Gaol, Buckingham and landlord to Thames Valley Police.

3 MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on the Tuesday 18 November 2014 were agreed as a correct record.

Matters Arising



INVESTOR IN PEOPLE



Timeline/scope of the internal review, the review being undertaken by Gate One and the Transport review are to be provided.

Action: Cabinet Member for Transportation/Gill Harding/Andrew Clarke

Forensic analysis report of the RJ contract is to be circulated to Committee Members when approved.

Action: Cabinet Member for Transportation/DSO

Details of the savings in the Transportation portfolio and re-investment are to be circulated to Committee Members when available.

Action: Gill Harding/DSO

Four Year plan is to be circulated to Committee Members.

Action: Cabinet Member for Transportation/DSO

A summary of the joint update on the grass cutting contract given at the Finance Select Committee meeting on the 30 September 2014 will be circulated to members of the ETL for information.

Action: Phil Gomm

4 PUBLIC QUESTIONS

There were no public questions.

An informal question has been received relating to the Library Service about software which will be picked up by Mr Butcher under item 6, Library Services in Bucks.

5 CHAIRMAN'S REPORT

The Chairman reported the following.

The Public Transport Inquiry report was presented at the November Cabinet meeting. The report was agreed with only two of the recommendations agreed in part. It was agreed with the Cabinet Member for Transportation that a progress update on the inquiry would be received in 6 months which gives the opportunity for the new business units to embed and give feedback on how they are starting to implement some of the recommendations. As most of the other recommendations were given a target date of the end of 2015, the Committee were keen to receive an update prior to this target date.

A meeting has taken place with the Chief Executive and the internal auditor to get an update on the Value for Money and Transport for Bucks exercise. It was a useful discussion but it was clear that there had been some misunderstanding about what the Committee has requested out of the recommendation. Further is awaited from the Chief Executive and the Auditor. This will be chased up. The Chief Executive will also be asked if minutes were taken at the meeting.

Action: Chairman

I was able to attend the Bus Expo at the NEC in October. It was interesting to gain an understanding about the bus industry, in terms of both the operators and the supply chain to the industry. This reinforced some of the assumptions made in the inquiry report. It was also useful to catch up with the key note speech from the minister, Patrick McCloughlin. Two important points were made about the role of the commercial sector and making sure they are supported to provide the services they do as well as the acknowledgement of the growing role of community transport to fill the gaps the commercial sector is unable to. It was noticeable that the community transport sector is seen as a small part of the industry and there was very

little at the show on smaller vehicles, in particular accessible vehicles that can be used by a number of operators.

6 LIBRARY SERVICES IN BUCKS

Martin Phillips, Cabinet Member for Community Engagement, David Jones, Service Director, Julia King, Reading Development Manager & Ruth Page, Culture Development Project Officer, were welcomed to the meeting.

The Chairman asked for a brief summary to reiterate in a succinct way the vision for the library service going forward for the next 5-10 years, and what the key elements and the core principles are.

Mr Jones explained that the version for the library service is predicated on the fact that emerging national picture for public library services is a year on year decrease in library usage. A new vision for library services is needed in order to ensure relevance and sustainability. This includes a way of maximising the asset – the building, and to increase the contribution that libraries make to priorities, both locally and nationally. The vision for the services is best articulated through the term; Face of the Council - Heart of the Community.

The Face of the Council is in recognition of the high footfall in libraries, the interaction with local residents and the fact we are IT intensive (there are all three channels in the libraries). Heart of the Community is in a sense, speaking of the high regard that residents have for the libraries and the attractiveness of the free, safe and accessible community spaces. We are also able to position ourselves in a unique way in terms of driving forward the agenda for digital inclusion.

The significance of digital inclusion for the County Council is that in order to reduce costs through digital channel shift, the Council will need to ensure that residents who do not have a computer or have a computer but don't know how to use it are not disenfranchised. The library service can position itself around that agenda.

In terms of key partnerships with organisations such as the Citizen's Advice Bureau, as from 2015, when there is a Government shift to most information services having to be accessed on line, partnership working needs to take place with organisations such as the library which can provide the space, staff and free access to IT.

The key actions in terms of the visions being realised is to remodel library spaces, to co-locate services and have more services delivered from the same place; to develop partnerships; to increase and enhance the volunteer capacity and to position ourselves at the centre of the Council's digital inclusion.

The Cabinet Member for Community Engagement explained that one aim is for the libraries to be developed into the public face of the Council. If people visit the library with a central council issue, they can be signposted into the right department to make the journey easier. This is an enhanced role for libraries.

During the update, the following questions were asked.

The library services in Buckinghamshire are unique in the country in many ways. Have visits taken place to libraries in other counties such as Tower Hamlets to look at other models to see how services can be improved? The vision has to look forward enough to make sure that a service which is not being used is not being protected and that people are using the service in the way they wish to. Mr Jones said best practice within the sector is being looked at to help inform the options appraisal. A visit has taken place to

Northamptonshire. They have an excellent service in terms of the library, the contact centre and web team being located in the same place. They also have the ability to foster jobs, employment skills and training.

A meeting has taken place with senior officers from Suffolk. The model adopted in Suffolk is the Industrial Providence Society model which is a co-operative approach. Visits have also taken place to Luton where there is a Trust (there are also Trusts in Peterborough and in Redbridge). A meeting has taking place with the Managing Director of Carillion. Carillion currently deliver library services on behalf on the London Borough of Ealing, Harrow and Hounslow. The competitor to Carillion is Greenwich Leisure who deliver library services in Greenwich and Wandsworth. A visit has also taken place to York where a staff mutual has just been rolled out. Essex and Westminster library services have developed a trading arm and deliver the library services in Slough. A variety of difference governance models has been looked at to try to identify best practice. Northants has demonstrated how a public library service can retain its core offer based on strong community and social values and can deliver the type of service we would like to in Bucks. Lambeth has a co-operative model but this has not demonstrated that any real contribution is being made. In terms of visits, the traffic seems to be much more towards Buckinghamshire because of the innovative model of mixed economy in terms of the community model. Bucks has been approached by lots of local authorities about the community library model and we have informed national research for DEFRA and spoken at conferences to share our learning in terms of developing sustainable services through community partnerships.

In terms of Tower Hamlets, there was a high profile launch of the new model for library services at Canary Wharf. There was massive investment in marketing and branding to try to address the fundamental challenge and which is when leisure trends are changing nationally, how can library services be re-purposed. Tower Hamlets approached this as a marketing exercise. There is learning to be taken from Tower Hamlets in terms of a consistent corporate approach and the remodelling of internal space which has become 'letable' space and can help drive services. We have done this with Chesham. The aim is to do the same with Buckingham and Aylesbury.

Risborough is working with Wycombe District Council to embed the information centre in the library. However there are constraints around opening times as the library does not open on Mondays. If partnerships are going to be developed to offer community services rather than library services, thought needs to be given to the remodelling of the library services. Mr Jones said that the possibility of the residents of Princes Risborough having access to the tourist information centre on a Monday or re-modelling the opening hours to find a compromise can be looked into. A cultural shift is needed to understand what working in partnership is. The aim is to co-locate services, reduce the costs and co-locate services but sometimes services do not always operate from the same level of parity. The move of the tourist information centre into Risborough Library is on track for December. The same model will be rolled out in Marlow. Thames Valley Police are already located in the libraries in Burnham, Farnham Common and Great Missenden. Where there is an announcement of the closure of a police station, engagement will take place about the possibility of co-locating to a community library.

Mrs King explained that library space is being used with partners. An example is a Dementia group is starting in Marlow on Monday. The library is closed on Mondays but the building is being made accessible.

Looking at the report, there does not appear to have been any involvement from participants from community libraries in terms of lessons learnt, what type of service they would like and whether there are services being provided which are not needed or gaps in service provision. Mr Jones explained that the focus of the report is on the development of a vision for the countywide library service. The community library partnerships in Bucks County Council has are 20% of the total business of the library service. There is a

light touch model in place which gives the freedom locally for local library services to be developed as well as the knowledge that behind the local freedoms is the support of the countywide infrastructure. The report does say in shaping the countywide vision, there will be engagement with community partners to share our thinking with them. Local library partnerships will have the freedom to be involved as much or as little as they would like to. We want define the co-ordinated offer for the county structure then look at how we can engage with community partners.

One issue which has been raised is the IT system programs such as Windows XP, being out of date. There does not seem to be the resources put in to update the software. Mr Jones said part of the strategy is to champion and drive digital inclusion on behalf of the County Council. For this to happen, there needs to be access to computers that are up to date. The computers and software in the community libraries are not deficient compared to those in Aylesbury lending library. There has been a struggle at times with the hardware and software. In terms of the roll out which is driven by corporate IT, the latest information is 'the project to upgrade the hardware and software that makes up the Peoples Network in the libraries has been ongoing since the middle of the year. Deployment of the new equipment will commence on the 1 December 2014. It is expected that all libraries (this includes community libraries) will be upgraded by the end of January 2015. The new pcs are a higher specification than those currently installed and we will be running window version 7 operating system. In addition, provision has been made to include internet explorer version 11 and chrome version 31, so that the public can use the browser of their choice'. In terms of engagement and dialogue with community library partners, regular review meetings take place to discuss any issues which are specific to that community library. There is a now a dedicated community library training support officer. Julia engages in terms of stock provision.

It is important that we as a Committee get a number of people who participate in the community libraries to tell us what their vision is as it could be different from what you are suggesting. Mr Jones explained that as part of the delivery model, the details of the logistics and operations are being looked into. A comparison can be made to a supermarket and the efficiency model where self-service technology is available. Community libraries deal with lower volumes of visitors and have a model which draws on local volunteers. The models are therefore quite different. To have a coordinated offer set to specific standards requires systems to be in place across a number of different sites. Community libraries tend to see the local library as being at the centre of the village community and having to drive the sustainability of the library.

The Cabinet Member for Community Engagement added that he visits a community library when he receives an invitation to do so. This is an opportunity to listen to their vision for the library service and suggestions for expanding the existing service.

Mrs King explained that in terms of workforce development and staff training, there is regular contact with community library partners. Discussions have taken place about the training which is being rolled out to county staff and offering this training to the volunteers who run the community libraries. This also applies to the Learn My Way offer. All of our community libraries are signed up to the national UK online and have access points. Work is taking place with Farnham Common library to deliver digital IT facilitated sessions to their community in the same way as the county library. The latest report is that in Farnham Common, the IT sessions are oversubscribed until Christmas. Questionnaires have been sent to the local community asking what type of IT support they would like. The Farnham Common offer is being tailored by their Committee and volunteers to reflect the responses received. This initiative is available to all other community libraries when they are ready to take it up.

Physical accessibility to mobile library services can be problematic in terms of access in rural areas, and access for wheelchair users and those with mobility problems, sight and hearing problems. How can this be overcome? Mrs King explained that mobile

libraries have a ramp and are wheelchair accessible. In terms of physical access, this should not be a problem.

There are sometimes problems with parking and the positioning of the vehicle when an individual is trying to get to the ramp. Mrs King explained when a stop for a mobile library is set up this is usually in conjunction with the local community. There has been a change in space in Stoke Mandeville as this was not considered to be a safe place. The stop has been moved from the Bell Public House to the school. We are very responsive to a siting if there are problems with access.

Where does the mobile library service lend itself to supporting those who are isolated? How does access to services such requests for large print books or access to the E-reader service tie in? Mrs King explained that mobile library services deliver the same level of support as a library branch would deliver. In terms of accessibility, mobile libraries have wi-fi and digital access which enables support to be given to those without a computer.

With regard to access to e-content, if an individual is able to come to the mobile library service, they would be supported in how to download the e-content. Unfortunately wi-fi access isn't as good in some rural communities as we would like it to be. Stoke Poges parish council has identified there is the need for the community to have an enhanced computer i.e. access to Learn My Way to improve digital skills. Work is taking place with the LAF representatives who are planning to install wi-fi in the Community Centre to look at whether the mobile library can piggy back on their wi-fi access. Large print and audio books are available on mobile library services. Books can be also ordered and delivered to a mobile service.

The future of mobile library service is not clear in the vision as well as possible synergies with other vehicles in the county such as youth services and the I-van. Mr Young said that the vision talks about using mobile services with partners to visit rural and isolated communities and to help the council ensure that residents in rural areas are as well informed as they are in urban areas. Pilot projects are taking place which look to replicate some principles of the community library strategy i.e. identifying existing activities in local community venues where local people are happy to engage with the Council and look at new models of delivery such as having a 'click and collect' service and book deposit collections. This initiative was recently launched in Lacey Green.

Mrs King said an example of work that is taking place is with Chiltern and South Bucks Citizens Advice Bureau who have recently launch their triage number to support local residents. The delivery of the service using the discreet space on a mobile van in Denham and St Leonards is being piloted. There are some constraints in the form of digital and wi-fi access. The possibility of offering a Skype service for members of the public to have a conversation with those in social services and children's services in County Offices is being considered.

The options of bringing the books to the people rather than the people to books and a click and collect service could have some merit when there is critical mass. Unfortunately none of this appears to be in the vision at the moment. Mr Jones said that this can be picked up in the work which is taking place.

The report doesn't give the vision for the library service for the next 5-10 years. It is more about what is being done now to try and accommodate today's requirements. There is no evidence in the report to support the move forward in the future. You said that you have spoken with other Local Authorities about their library models but this information is not in the report. Details are needed about the longer term vision for the library service

The report mentions governance models and the different options such as mutual and co-operative. In terms of the future vision of library services, how do you see the

governance model as a way of achieving what the vision might be? Mr Jones said the timeframe for the changes to the library service has been aligned to the Future Shape programme. An options appraisal will take place in April 2015 in terms of the different alternatives and delivery vehicles. As part of the Medium Term Plan (MTP), a business case is being developed giving details of how quickly we could move forward and develop a detailed business case to deliver significant cost reductions. The report focuses on the 'Face of the Council – Heart of the Community' and trying to identify against the context of the decline of the usage of a traditional library service, a role for a library service which makes sense both locally and nationally and how this can be delivered. Delivery would be through alternative governance. The report details the benefits and opportunities of developing a trading arm and moving towards a commercial entrepreneur approach. An option for immediate savings would be the move to a not for profit organisation status. We need to identify the direction of travel and key milestones in terms of governance.

Where does the report flag up the outcomes of the service i.e. in 6 months / 1 year?

The report is a bit too generic. Rather than stating the 5 year vision, it is missing the illustration of examples of what the library service would look like in 2020.

There have been lots of cutbacks to the library service over the last couple of years and services are already stretched. In the new vision, how is value for money going to be assessed for the Council, how will the value for money and cuts impact on the Council and the residents that use the service or will be unable to use the service? Mr Jones said that the paper shows the scale of savings that have been experienced and the reduction in costs of a million over the last four years. The savings in the current MTP in the next three years is over half a million. The new governance model and opportunities it could bring demonstrates that savings of a quarter of a million could be made by moving to new governance. Further work needs to take place on a more detailed business plan.

How do you intend to generate additional income and how will the residents in the community be able to interact with income generation? Mr Jones explained that 6 months, Bucks County Council was made aware of an opportunity to tender to deliver stock services for other library services in the south of the England. When the details of the tender were received, there was the realisation that staff would have to be recruited in order to deliver the service. The decision was therefore made not to proceed with the opportunity. The realisation is that as a directly delivered county council service we could only tender based on cost recovery but as an arms-length organisation, we could tender based on profit. Developing a trading arm is one of the ways that income generating opportunities can be maximised. Another way of generating income would be through working with partners and being commissioned to deliver against outcomes.

Mrs King added that work is taking place with Public Health to look at the roll out of accredited training for health champions. Libraries are also being looked at to deliver the key objectives for public health information and supporting residents to improve their health outcomes.

The vision is to change the existing model. What would the impact on library services be if the existing model remained? Mr Jones said any services which do not appear to be front line could be pulled out or the number of libraries and the opening hours could be reduced. The appearance would be the same number of libraries, the same service, operating to the same opening hours. In terms of the opportunities to devolve more to communities, we are at a point where the models which have previously worked successful no longer lend themselves to the size of the libraries. If cuts continue we would be salami slicing. It is about how we can fundamentally change the model to deliver significant savings.

What would the trading arm do differently, that the library service which cannot currently do? Mr Jones said the library service would be able to compete in the emerging

market to deliver library services or parts of library services on behalf of other local authorities which could be done at a profit.

Has this been looked at the other way round i.e. the service being bought in from someone else and the difference in the cost of this? Mr Jones explained that the options appraisal will include the option to tender the entire service to another operator which is why discussions have taken place with Carillion and Greenwich Borough Council.

The possible delivery of other services should be looked at as well as how services are delivered rather than cutting existing services.

How is the impact of digital inclusion as well as the programmes and activities currently run by the library measured and what data is collected? Mr Jones explained that work has taken place over the last year to put in a system to measure data. This includes new performance measures to reflect new areas of work. Issues and visits are the traditional areas such as activity. There is now Learn My Way, the free online training which is accredited by the Government. The programme gives a standardised template of informal learning which can be rolled out across the county council. The programme is delivered by staff supported by volunteers and allows the levels of learning to be tracked. The data is generated on a monthly basis and can provide such information such as the number of people who have enrolled on the programme.

Mrs King said IT usage in the library has increased to over 12,000 log-ins per month. This technology to track usage is currently installed in only 8 libraries so in reality this figure is higher. This is a massive increase in the number of people visiting the library to use a public computer.

It is fully understood that the library service is a statutory service. Is there not the feeling that it is time to change and drop the term 'library' and turn the libraries into community centres and mobile community centres as this would give a totally different inference to the service. Mr Jones explained that is the vision the report is trying to articulate. The idea that there will be buildings that have at their core a library that allows you to borrow books but there is also a range of other services available in the same building. The word 'library' is highly potent and has massive emotional attachment. As we change and remodel the service, changing the term 'library' could be counter-productive in terms of provoking a strong negative reaction from those who use the library as they feel they are losing a service. The feeling is that the word 'library' can stay as it is a powerful word. In order for libraries to be sustainable, the range of services co-located in the same place needs to be broadened. This brings down the cost and will diversify the offer.

The Cabinet Member for Community Engagement added that if the word 'library' is removed, it could appear that the County Council is planning to disinvest in library services.

If a new model and partnerships are being developed but your own standard model is not being adjusted and you are trying to make partnerships fall into your model, this needs to be adjusted.

The Chairman summarised the observations of Committee Members as follows;

- There is a lack of evidence in terms of data. It would be useful to see data for the library service for the last 5/10 years to give an idea of the decline in footfall and issues as well as the increase in areas such as IT usage, E-publishing and loans. This data would help to illustrate what the library service is in the 21st century.
- Several gaps in the report have been identified such as marketing and membership drive
- The report mentions the development of the Business Plan in April 2015. It would be useful for the Committee to meet as an informal working group to look at the draft business plan,

to gain an understanding of the evidence and data being used to drive the business plan and to ask questions. A meeting is to be arranged in January after the MTP.

Action: Policy Officer

- If the aim is to be entrepreneurial and trading, has the market been tested and are opportunities still available to market services
- If discussions are going to take place with community libraries, the County Council's own in house market should be tested to see if the right services are being provided locally.
- The report could be more provocative in its thinking and its vision and also be clearer about what will the library service will look like in 2020 and how much it will cost to provide the service.
- The engagement with existing and new users, the role with schools and youth groups etc is an area which is not touched upon in the report.

The Chairman thanked the Mr Phillips, Mr Jones, Mrs King and Ms Page for the report and for answering questions from Committee members.

7 SECTION 106: INQUIRY STATUS UPDATE AND NEXT STEPS

John Rippon, Policy and Planning Business Manager, Place was welcomed to the meeting.

Mr Rippon gave the following summary of the current position of the S106 process, the scope of future and ongoing lines of inquiry to identify and refine key areas for further examination.

The S106 inquiry is split into four key areas; governance, commissioning and delivery, local engagement and Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL).

Governance: Internal Policy and Process

This is about ensuring that robust systems are in place to effectively manage the creation and monitoring of S106 agreements, including payments and budget management.

Work that has taken place today includes;

- Systems are currently being developed jointly with Finance, Legal Services, and Highways Development Management team
- All of the funding is now held in the corporate reserve account
- The creation of a central register of all the S106 agreements across the County Council. External Interim support has called in to help with this (2 days a week).
- A stronger audit trail needs to be created within the process. The onus is currently on the developer to come forward with a payment once the trigger in the 106 agreement has been hit. A more proactive stance approach is needed in terms of sending standard notifications to developers and presentation of invoices to they can be tracked through the system.
- Better use of IT systems such as Uniform – the County Council's planning database. This system is used to record County Council planning applications and consultation responses.
- The possibility of expanding the scope of the system to include highways responses
- As part of the future shape programme, there will be a new s106 officer post created in the Transport, Economy and Environment structure. Recruitment to the post will take place in the New Year.

Commissioning and delivery of s106 schemes

This is to ensure that schemes are effectively delivered and S106 funds are spent in a timely fashion.

- This is an ongoing area of concern particularly where there are historic contributions and where there is the need to get the schemes delivered on the ground.
- Work is taking place with TfB and Ringway Jacobs to produce a rolling annual programme of schemes.

- TfB submitted a draft proposal which sets out how they would like to address this going forward. These programmes will be reported through the Business Investment Group to release the funds and allow the capital budget to be managed more effectively.
- Close working is taking place with TfB and Ringway Jacobs to jointly develop project briefs, have clear time bound outcomes and objectives and have better communication and consultation with local residents and Members.
- There could be potential economies of scale by tying elements together such as other work programmes for Local Area Forums and TfB
- Bringing together historic S106 schemes as a priority. In some cases there could be the need to consider re-negotiation of the terms of the S106 agreements

Councillors and local influence in s106 agreements/contributions

To ensure that Local Members and Communities have a genuine influence in securing the best outcomes to mitigate the impact of development.

- Is the County Council asking developers for the right schemes? How can the County Council ensure that it is meeting the aspirations of the local community? This would partly involve the Highways Development Management team in terms of how can they make more informed decisions. Processes and cultures within the teams are being looked at.
- There is the potential to develop a large degree of community engagement through Local Area Forums. Many LAFs have a wish-list of schemes for which they look for funding through a delegated budget. Very often there are insufficient funds available to deliver the needs. Again it is a case of joining up the processes in terms of what happens on the ground and with the Highways team.
- Ensuring that local Members are being briefed on the responses received about local planning applications. This is about getting a true sense of local perspective from local members to enable informed decisions to be given about planning advice to planning authorities.
- In the absence of local plans and the advent of the National Policy Planning Framework, the service needs to be bolder in terms of its asks especially with medium and larger planning applications and to tie this in with major infrastructure proposals where funds are being sought through other sources i.e. the LEP.
- Work is taking place with other local planning authorities around the emerging local plans, helping to shape and influence the plans to meet the needs in housing and growth, informing CIL lists and how this can be supported.

Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) and partnership working

This is an area for further discussion and development.

- Bucks County Council is not a CIL collecting authority. With this in mind, how can the County Council best influence the district councils to secure better transport through CIL and how can local needs to be captured in this process? There is still the option of s106 agreements but these are likely to be heavily scrutinised through planning appeals.
- Other possible funding sources need to be looked at such as match funding by the use of local growth funds from the Department of Transport.
- Wycombe is the only area which has not adopted the CIL charging schedule. It is unlikely that a charging schedule will be seen in Aylesbury Vale for a few years.

During discussions, the following points were made and questions were asked.

It sounds as if positive steps are being made particularly in terms of governance and management.

Work with local members is paramount.

One area of concern is the lack of s106 monies being put into the cultural side such as museums. S106s should be broadened to pick up the cultural side not just the infrastructure.

Is there a programme for the introduction for CIL across the country or is introduction at the discretion of the local district council. The introduction of CIL is at the discretion of district councils. CIL regulations become statute in April 2015. Even with the ongoing S106 agreements, there will be the need to meet the tests of CIL regulations. Whether planning authorities develop and adopt CIL charging schedules on the back of local plans or not would depend largely on the levels of growth and development within those respective areas. Wycombe naturally lends itself to CIL because of the potential housing need over the next 20 years. Some of the other areas such as South Bucks are heavily affected by Green belt constraints and are therefore not necessarily going to experience that quantum of development, don't lend themselves to the supporting the CIL schedule.

There is concern that many other groups will want to be involved and there will be too many involved in the process. The Member is elected represent the process and the majority of the people in their area. This should be contained.

Recommendations

- The Committee is asked to agree all or some of the key areas as general terms of reference for inquiry refining scope, as agreed in June, into clear work streams.
- The Committee is asked to agree that the inquiry evidence will be received through the ETL committee, inviting the Chairman of the FPR select committee and will be added to the committee work programme for February/March 2015. All evidence will be heard in one committee meeting.
- The Committee is asked to agreed that in December 2014/January 2015, the Policy Officer is to undertake desk research on behalf of the committee, collating background information, identifying key witnesses and other Local Authority processes and to develop inquiry timetable/plan and to arrange an evidence session for February/March 2015.

Members of the Committee agreed that the following should remain in scope;

- **Further work to look at CIL in more detail**
- **How the local influence and councillors work needs further investigation**
- **The commissioning of the delivery of S106 schemes – there is concern about the slowness of delivery in some divisions**
- **Internal processes and policies**

The following was also agreed;

- **A one day inquiry session is to be held in February/March 2015. Attendees are to be confirmed (Wycombe and Aylesbury Vale, a representative of the Royal Town and Planning Institute).**
- **The Policy Officer is to continue with some desk research to provide better evidence to format questions and provide guidance.**

8 EXTERNAL FUNDING OPPORTUNITIES

Peter Hardy, Cabinet Member for Finance and Resources was welcomed to the meeting.

The Cabinet Member thanked members of the committee for allowing an update to be given on external funding opportunities and to be able to respond to the letter of recommendation sent following the committee's investigative work in relation to the Council's approach to external funding opportunities prior to a written response being provided.

The Cabinet Member said that the Committee's anxiety that the Authority may be missing out on external funding streams is shared. Is this a real anxiety or a theoretical problem? Is it just transport where the Committee feels the Authority is missing out on external funding opportunities or is does this also apply to other areas of the Council such as social care. Evidence is needed of the areas where the Authority is missing out as well as numbers to support this investment in the additional resources and processes being put forward by the committee, is to be justified.

The Cabinet Member said that he is personally against the creation of corporate roles second guessing the new business units in future shape. The rationale behind future shape is to have a slim but very effective Head Quarters organisation with maximum responsibility devolved to business units.

Part of the mandate of the business units is to generate additional income and we would expect them to do so. It is up to the business units to find funding wherever available. The business units should allocate appropriate resources to enable this to be done.

The HQ role is to hold the business units to account against outcomes, not to do the work for the business units. Each business unit will be required to submit an annual business plan which goes via the One Council Board to Cabinet. The idea that the report should include a section in the plans reporting on possible external funding opportunities and how these are being taken advantage of is supported.

The Council is pursuing an active programme of devolving responsibility to delivery units such as Trusts and business units, with better access to external funding. A key element is for the options appraisal is a structure which has the ability to support external funding. Examples of this are the Museum pursuing lottery funding, Community groups running libraries and the decision in Transport to take up shovel ready schemes.

The local government is restricted in its ability to find external funding and has to work in different ways to achieve maximum advantage.

A way of taking this forward would be to include in the mandate for the new innovative units, the role of generating further proposals for delivery units that can attract external funding.

During discussions, the following questions were asked.

The Committee is saying that it thinks there are opportunities for external funding but how is this being harnessing and how can a clear corporate approach to this be developed. The innovation unit should look at new structures that can attract additional funding. We want to incentivise the business units to find funding but also income to achieve their outcomes.

During evidence gathering sessions, verbal evidence from various sources identified a lack of capacity within the organisation to put together robust bids for known funding sources. If there is a reliance on an ad-hoc approach, the danger is potentially missing out on funding streams as well as the potential of sharing throughout the organisation about successful bids as well as the failures and bids which are unsuccessful.

There is also the issue of where we do not know where the funding is, the opportunities and capacity within the organisation to search some of the more obscure pots of money. This requires a set of skills not every officer would have. If the knowledge and skills base is not shared, the authority could potentially lose out on some bids. Is the committee looking for evidence about the amount of monies the authority is losing out on to justify the investments in corporate capacity and processes that the committee is recommending? We want the HQ function to be as slim and as efficient as possible. It is difficult to put additional roles in without evidential justification.

In terms of going out to market for sponsorship and advertising opportunities, there are risks of a clash between business units where there isn't an overarching policy or details of how this type of external funding might be approached.

What training would the business units have to enable them to try and source external funding opportunities? If there is the obligation to try to find external funding, staff would need to know how to do this.

Sourcing external funding is a new role for business units to take on. The committee needs to be assured that there is the capability of this being achieved as it is a complete new way of thinking for officers. Some progress is being made. Our HR team is already competing for contracts with other local authorities.

Things are changing. The authority needs to adapt and move with the process. The feeling is that a specialist is needed to look into external funding. Could this person be employed on a commission basis in order to reduce the revenue strain on the Council?

It would be helpful to have a structure to explain how the business units work and the benefits of having this structure. There will be four business units; adults, children, transport, economy, environment and support services. They will work with a number of delivery units on a contractual basis. The main driver is the outcomes required by the HQ organisation as guided and informed by members, in terms of being member led. They will produce business plans detailing how the outcomes can be achieved with the resources available. This information will be cascaded down to the Managing Directors of the business units. The membership of the Business Units Boards will include a Managing Director as well as a number of Cabinet Members. We need to make sure that the business units are motivated, incentivised and accountable in delivering the outcomes they are contracted to do. The business unit plans have to address where external funding opportunities can be found. Innovation unit should look for new structures to enable the attraction of additional funding for the Council as a whole.

During the initial discussions by the Future Shape Programme Board, there was the tendency to re-invent the strategic function and put this all in the HQ. The idea is to devolve responsibility to business units because they are then accountable for delivery, the County Council must be an outcomes based organisation and for obtaining the funding to do this. The recommendations sent to the Cabinet Member for Finance and Resources from the ETL Select Committee were as follows;

Recommendation 1: We recommend that BCC develop a clear corporate approach towards identifying and securing external funding, including use of data, how approaches are to be written into terms of reference for Business Units and contracts, and how any joint funding arrangements with partners are to be developed.

Recommendation 2: We recommend that corporate capacity for overseeing, coordinating and sharing intelligence for external funding bids be developed across Business Units in order to maximise opportunities to secure and use external funding, and minimise duplication and/or isolation of bidding activity.

Recommendation 3: We recommend that, to eradicate an ad hoc approach to external funding, a clear position (across Business Units) on officer time and coordination in relation to external funding be developed, and that appropriate training of officers on how to secure external funding be delivered in accordance with Future Shape commercial activity proposals. (It may be more efficient to employ an officer with targets etc. A simple business case would need to be developed to aid the decision).

Recommendation 4: We recommend, in order to ensure transparency and accountability, that external funding applications be captured in a central register and/or in published documents such as Cabinet Member annual reports, Commercial Plans, or financial quarter reports. This would allow the authority to develop a 'corporate memory' of lessons to learn from funding bids, share best practice/intelligence, and to raise the profile of external funding impacts.

Recommendation 5: We recommend that BCC uses the opportunity presented by Future Shape to enhance its approach to external funding with Business Units taking the lead for development guided by coordination from the corporate HQ and member input.

Recommendation 6: We support the ambition for an enhanced customer insight function within Future Shape proposals and recommend that intelligence from this function be applied to external funding bids and proposals along with cross-referencing against an external funding 'wish list' and prioritisation schemes.

The Committee agreed the following.

Recommendation 1

Clarification is needed on what the business units will be tasked to do.

Recommendation 2

Assurance is needed on how the successes and failures of bids for external funding are shared to enable the organisation to learn from this.

Recommendation 3

If the business units are given the full responsibility, how can it be ensured that an ad-hoc approach to external funding will be avoided?

Recommendation 4

Continuing with the theme of learning and the sharing of knowledge within the organisation, there is the fear that the business units will recreate silo working and that the bids made by each business unit could impact on each other. It needs to be ensured that cross organisation working is not lost sight of.

Recommendation 6

This recommendation is based on the some of the feedback received from Bucks Business First (BBF) and the Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP). There is concern about can it be ensured the organisation does not miss the opportunities it doesn't know about.

The Cabinet Member explained that there are relatively few funding opportunities available to local government. The creation of the delivery units will allow additional opportunities to be found for the County Council as a whole. The idea of using the enhanced customer insight function is supported as this is a HQ role.

The Cabinet Member said the paper, points raised during discussion and his initial thoughts will be taken to the Future Shape Programme Board for discussion, following which a formal written response will be sent to the ETL Committee.

Action: Cabinet Member for Finance and Resources

The Chairman advised that the formal response would be shared with the Finance and Resource Select Committee. As the areas by the ETL Select Committee are being addressed, any further updates should be given to the Finance and Resources Select Committee.

Members of the Committee NOTED the work programme.

The work programme will be discussed in more detail at the working group taking place in December.

10 DATE OF THE NEXT MEETING

The next meeting is due to take place on Tuesday 3 February 2015 in Mezzanine 2, County Offices, Aylesbury. There will be a pre-meeting for Committee Members at 9.30am.

Meeting dates for 2015

17 March	21 July
14 April	8 September
19 May	6 October
23 June	17 November

CHAIRMAN