

Minutes

BUCKS STRATEGIC PARTNERSHIP BOARD

MINUTES OF THE BUCKS STRATEGIC PARTNERSHIP BOARD HELD ON TUESDAY 4 MAY 2010, IN HEDSOR HOUSE, HEDSOR PARK, TAPLOW, BUCKINGHAMSHIRE, SL6 0HX, COMMENCING AT 2.32 PM AND CONCLUDING AT 4.44 PM.

Members Present

Ms L Blue

Ms J Brown

Mr A Busby

Mrs L Clarke

Ms J Dudley

Mr S George

Mr M Howell

Mr M Hunt

Mrs R Lally

Mr A Pratt OBE

Mr W Ralls

Mr D Shakespeare OBE (C)

Mr J Warder

Mr W Whyte

Superintendent George Wrigley

BALC

Joint Director of Strategy &
System Reform,
Buckinghamshire Hospitals
Trust

Chairman of South Bucks
LSP/Leader of SBDC

Chairman of Wycombe
LSP/Leader of WDC

NHS Buckinghamshire

Chair, Buckinghamshire PCT
Trust Board

Chairman, OBMH

Encompass

Adult Commissioners

Business Representative

Area Director, SEEDA

Leader of BCC

Leader of CDC / Chairman,
Chiltern LSP

Chair, Aylesbury Vale LSP

Safer and Stronger Bucks
Partnership Board

Observers

Mr C Furness, Observer - Chief Executive, SBDC

Mrs G Gowing, Chiltern District Council

Mr A Grant, Observer - Chief Executive, AVDC

Ms E Macdonald, Observer - Bucks Locality Manager, GOSE

Ms K Satterford, Observer - Chief Executive, WDC

Officers

Mrs S Ashmead, Head of Policy, Performance and Communications

Mrs J Fisk, Team Leader, Policy and Partnerships

Ms H Wailing, Democratic Services Officer

Guests

Mr R Collis, Buckinghamshire Community Foundation
Mr P Cowen, BT
Mr R Dickson, Buckinghamshire Community Foundation
Mr I Flexer, BELP
Mr G Grover, BELP
Ms B Kerley, Job Centre Plus
Mr G Peart, Buckinghamshire Community Foundation
Mr A Shephard, Deputy Lieutenant
Ms S Yapp, Safer and Stronger Bucks Thematic Partnership

1 WELCOME

Alexander Shephard DL, owner of Hedsor House, welcomed members of the BSP Board to the meeting.

2 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE / CHANGES IN MEMBERSHIP

Apologies for absence

Apologies for absence were received from Jim Booth (Chief Executive, Thames Valley Police Authority), John Cartwright (Leader, Aylesbury Vale District Council), Chief Superintendent Paul Emmings (Safer and Stronger Bucks Partnership Board), Alan Goodrum (Chief Executive, Chiltern District Council), Jenny Hunt (Voluntary Impact), Sue Imbriano (Buckinghamshire Children's Trust), Ed Macalister-Smith (Chief Executive, NHS Buckinghamshire), Patrick Martin (BALC), David Rowlands (Fire Authority) and Chris Williams (Chief Executive, Buckinghamshire County Council).

Members noted the following were in attendance as substitutes for the duration of the meeting:

Superintendent George Wrigley (substitute for Paul Emmings)
Gill Gowing (substitute for Alan Goodrum)
Jane Dudley (substitute for Ed Macalister-Smith)
Lesley Blue (substitute for Patrick Martin)

Changes in membership

The representative from the Learning and Skills Council was now Penny Askew (previously Jill Goddard).

The representative for the Safer and Stronger Bucks Partnership Board was now Chief Superintendent Paul Emmings (previously Paul Tinnion).

The representative from OBMH was now Martin Howell.

Bianca Kerley would be attending Board meetings representing Job Centre Plus.

3 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Lesley Clarke declared an interest in Item 6 as she was Chairman of Wycombe Youth Action. Wycombe Youth Action had received some funding from the Buckinghamshire Community Foundation.

4 MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 28 JANUARY 2010

The Minutes of the meeting held on 28 January 2010 were agreed and signed as a correct record.

5 BSP IMPLEMENTATION GROUP UPDATE REPORT

The Board received the Update Report from the Bucks Strategic Implementation Group (BSPIG).

Jackie Fisk (Team Leader, Policy and Partnerships) told members the following:

- At the meeting of the BSP Board in January 2010, members had considered priority areas which had been identified by the thematic partnerships. BSPIG had looked at the actions requested and a draft work programme had been produced (Appendix A).
- A national report on 'Total Place' had recently been published. The Report had addressed the 13 pilot areas. BSPIG would keep the BSP Board updated regarding progress on the 'Total Place' initiative.
- Rob Hathaway (Audit Commission Lead for Buckinghamshire) had recently updated BSPIG and had commended Buckinghamshire on the quality of its partnership discussions. Areas of focus for the Audit Commission would include the preventative agenda and the value for money agenda. Rob Hathaway had also asked for a list of areas in which Buckinghamshire could show particular innovation and good practice. These would be considered by the thematic partnerships.
- The BSP Annual Report 2009/10 would be submitted for the July meeting of the BSP Board. The Report would include information on performance over the past year and also seek agreement for improvement work for the following year.
- Performance for the Local Area Agreement (LAA) for the third quarter of 2009-10 was on track for most of the indicators. A full performance report would be brought to the BSP Board in July.
- Appendix B showed a summary of BSPIG decisions which had been taken on behalf of the BSP Board, regarding the LAA pooled fund and the BSP Fund.
- BSPIG had discussed a first draft of the Bucks Economic Assessment, and this had been circulated for wider comment by partners. Further information would be brought to the July meeting of the BSP Board.
- The Report included information on the Buckinghamshire Pathfinder.
- Members were asked to consider a change to the Board membership, with the addition of two places for voluntary and community sector representatives. This followed a focus at strategic level for expanding the voice of the voluntary and community sector. The two places would be debated with the sector by Community Impact Bucks.
- Community Impact Bucks had been launched on 1 April 2010 and was the new integrated voluntary infrastructure organisation. Community Impact Bucks was a merger of Buckinghamshire Community Action, The Priory Centre, Vale Volunteers and Voluntary Action.

A member said that the Aylesbury Vale LSP had asked if the Board's work programme could include the proposed High Speed 2 railway (HS2). Jackie Fisk said that BSPIG would discuss this at its next meeting.

A member asked why two items on page 13 were marked in yellow. Jackie Fisk said

that these were 'in principle' decisions which needed to be looked at in more detail by BSPIG.

Sarah Ashmead (Head of Policy, Performance and Communications) said that funding for those items had been 'earmarked' but that more detail on how the funding would be spent was required. The two items came under the governance of the 'Tackling Disadvantage' programme.

RESOLVED

The BSP Board:

- **Agreed the Board's work programme for 2010/11.**
- **Noted and commented on the basket of projects to be developed under the BSP Total Place approach.**
- **Noted and commented on the pooled funding decisions approved by BSP Implementation Group on the Board's behalf.**
- **Endorsed the proposal to allocate an additional two Board places to representatives from the voluntary and community sector (to be developed by Community Impact Bucks).**

6 BROADBAND IN BUCKINGHAMSHIRE

Andrew Grant (Chief Executive, Aylesbury Vale District Council) introduced this item.

Ian Flexer (BELP) then gave a presentation to members, which contained several proposals for Broadband provision in Buckinghamshire. During the presentation, Ian Flexer made the following points:

- BELP believed that the data available greatly understated the number of small businesses working from home.
- Any undertaking regarding broadband provision would have to consider several issues, including whether any financial return was required.

Members then asked questions. The questions and answers are summarised below.

A target of 40 mbps (mega bits per second) by 2015 seems a huge increase on the current provision. Is it going to be achievable?

It will definitely be possible. Every year the technology improves. If anything, we should aim for an even higher level of provision by 2015.

How will you secure the networks? Security of the networks needs to be prioritised.

Security of the networks is a priority issue, as is traffic control.

Why don't you open up the provision to all areas and 'seed-fund' those areas which most want it?

We use the statistics as our starting point, but also use feedback from each area.

How does BT prioritise areas for provision?

Networks tend to work best commercially at a growth of clusters. Clusters can be extended to fill in 'not spots' (e.g. in Sittingbourne in Kent).

A member noted that Buckinghamshire Hospitals Trust and OBMH each had their

own networks, and that this was not noted in the presentation.

Concerns were raised about the security issues of any shared networks, and this was noted but it was emphasised that the issue was around traffic segregation.

A member noted that SEEDA was working on a Broadband Strategy, with the aim of bringing local voices together.

It was also noted that BT had met with SEEDA recently and had agreed to hold two educational events. BT's main advice was to choose provision on an open network.

Members then split into five tables and discussed the three questions at the end of the presentation. The three questions and the comments given are summarised below.

Peter Cowen (BT) was in attendance at the meeting as a supporting expert.

**Question 1 - Is there sufficient information available to inform this support?
Any gaps?**

- Board members emphatic on need for clarity on the funding of the business case and clarity on the strategy – is it a strategy primarily around supporting business, or is a social cohesion focus? The business case, and funding, will differ.
- Awareness-raising is needed re: why 2mgps is not a sufficient level of provision.
- We need to explain to residents why different levels of provision are necessary.
- Are we aware of existing gaps in provision?
- What provision will be required in the future by large users (e.g. hospitals)?
- What is the main aim of increased provision – are we aiming to support big businesses, entrepreneurs or personal use?
- What advantages are there to the public sector in funding increased provision?
- Increased provision can encourage good neighbours (self-help).
- The pattern of areas which have low or no provision is surprising. Is there public demand for increased provision?
- Other needs which will increase include Telecare.
- How much will residents be prepared to pay for Broadband?
- There is no other option except to increase Broadband provision for the future.
- The need for increased provision is there and will grow in the future.
- Investment – how much, and where from?
- A 'quick win' could be achieved through ensuring fibre provision in all new dwellings.

**Question 2 - Are the options for potential models of delivery clear to Members?
What are their respective advantages/disadvantages?**

What are members' views in informing the way forward?

- There needs to be a balance between providing SMEs (small and medium enterprises) with Broadband, and community wellbeing.
- More information on what is going on elsewhere in the UK is needed.
- If there is a demand, why is a commercial company not already addressing this?
- A lot of work is already going on re: Broadband in schools etc. More scoping

work is needed.

- Inviting bids from a specialist provider is the best use of time.
- Is this a public sector or a private sector responsibility?
- Is this core business for local authorities/public sector organisations?
- How would funding work – would residents with increased provision be charged?
- Plans are needed for how any profit would be used.
- Scope for involvement of social enterprise.
- Open networks are desirable.

Question 3 - What is the potential for shared networks?

Which partners could be involved?

What are members' views on opportunities/challenges in developing shared networks?

- There is a potential for sharing networks (with commercial firms too).
- The negative perception of data sharing is a large challenge and should not be minimised.
- Other partners needs to be involved (e.g. universities, Job centre Plus etc.)
- What are the existing contractual arrangements for Broadband in Buckinghamshire, and can they be amended?
- Decision-making in some organisations may be at national level, which could be a stumbling-block.
- There is the possibility of some negative press.
- It should be cheaper to have a network solution for the whole of Buckinghamshire than for partners to operate their own.
- It is essential for all partners to be involved.
- Sharing networks is part of a mixed economy. We need to ensure that minor providers are not priced out.
- Capacity needs to be looked at – e.g. personal use should not take capacity away from hospitals.

Ian Flexer thanked members for their input and said that it seemed that in principle the BSP Board supported the proposals, with a number of caveats. A not-for-profit model seemed to be most popular, but with some involvement from the private sector. More information was required on security, pricing and clarity on the focus of the strategy around which the business case will be developed.

Action: Each organisation to identify an individual to work with BELP regarding Broadband.

RESOLVED

The BSP Board:

- **Reaffirmed commitment to the Broadband programme through the support requested.**
- **Commented on the delivery models proposed to provide the infrastructure required to satisfy rural and 'not-spot' areas.**
- **Entered into dialogue to share existing infrastructure and network solutions to service residential and business locations.**

7 BUCKINGHAMSHIRE COMMUNITY FOUNDATION

Richard Dickson (Buckinghamshire Community Foundation - BCF) was welcomed to

the meeting.

Richard Dickson gave a presentation about the work of the BCF.

In addition to the information in the presentation, Richard Dickson made the following points:

- The BCF worked to achieve a balance between the public, private and voluntary/community sectors.
- BCF offered very good value for money, supporting 'grass roots' groups.
- There had been a record number of grant applications in the previous two years.
- BCF had five paid staff, and a large number of volunteer staff.
- The Bucks Strategic Partnership had contributed £0.1m to the BCF in 2009, and a report would be going to the next BSPIG meeting regarding the impact of the funding. BCF would also monitor the outcomes quarterly for the next few years.

A member asked if the BCF had criteria for giving grants. Richard Dickson said that a score-card system was used.

A member asked to what extent BCF measured outcomes. Richard Dickson said that BCF was still learning how to measure outcomes, rather than activity. Measuring outcomes was not an exact science, and these were difficult to measure. At the end of each year, the BCF visited groups which had received funding, to assess the impact of the funding.

The Chairman thanked Richard Dickson for attending the meeting.

The Chairman also thanked Alexander Shephard DL for allowing the BSP Board to use Hedsor House and for the warm welcome which they had received.

8 DATE OF NEXT MEETING

2010

13 July 2010, 2:30pm, The Coach House, Green Park Training & Conference Centre, Stablebridge Road, Aston Clinton

30 September 2010, 2:30pm, Uplands Conference Centre, Four Ashes Road, Cryers Hill, High Wycombe, HP15 6LB

2011

20 January 2011, 2:30pm, venue tbc

11 May 2011, 2:30pm, venue tbc

12 July 2011, 2:30pm, venue tbc

CHAIRMAN