

CHILTERN AND SOUTH BUCKS JOINT COMMITTEE

Meeting - 16 July 2014

Present: Mr Busby, Mrs Cranmer, Mrs Darby, Mr Harris, Mr Martin, Mr Naylor, Mr Reed, Mr D Smith, Mr Stannard, Mr Wilson and Mrs Woolveridge

Apologies for absence: Mr Hudson

1. MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting of the Joint Committee held on 2 April 2014 were agreed by the Committee and signed by the Chairman.

2. PROGRAMME REPORT

The Joint Committee received the latest programme report detailing the progress on milestones and future activities, the latest budget position including cumulative savings, joint projects outside of service reviews and risks for the programme.

3. SHARED IT HIGHLIGHT REPORT

The Joint Committee received the latest shared IT highlight report detailing progress, including tasks completed, on the following shared projects during the period 7 April to 16 June 2014:

- Idox Uniform and DMS
- Ericom
- Web
- Telephony/Unified Communications

In response to a question about Ericom, the Director of Resources confirmed that, whilst there were still a few issues to resolve to get it fully functioning to users' satisfaction, the system was allowing access to key applications from both sites.

4. EXCLUSION OF PUBLIC

"that under Section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act 1974 the public be excluded from the meeting for the following items of business on the grounds that they involve the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Part 1 of Schedule 12A to the Act"

Note: the relevant paragraph number and description is indicated under the Minute heading.

5. BUSINESS CASE FOR A SHARED COMMUNITY SERVICE

Paragraph 3 – Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particularly person (including the authority holding that information)

The Joint Committee received a report setting out the result of a shared service review of community services. The report detailed the business case, the conclusion of which was that

Chiltern and South Bucks Joint Committee - 16 July 2014

the case for a joint service had been proven and therefore that a joint service should be established. The proposed joint service would deliver greater resilience, improve service quality, increase capacity and reduce costs.

After noting that the Cabinet Portfolio Holders for Planning and Environment/Sustainable Development had not been consulted on an aspect of the report prior to publication, the Chief Executive assured the meeting that he would take appropriate action to ensure that the procedure is adhered to in the future and that Cabinet Portfolios affected by a service proposal are kept abreast of developments.

In response to questions a number of issues were clarified as follows:

- “Revit” was shorthand for “revitalisation” groups;
- The meaning and purpose of community led planning and community walkabouts, both of which would involve no additional costs or requirements to the planning service;
- Why the additional IT requirements were considered to be necessary ;
- Confirmation that the savings resulting in the deletion of the post of Head of Community Services had not already been captured, and that there was no double counting in the savings figures;
- The costs of providing Community services to CDC were slightly higher than the cost of providing support to SBDC because of the additional support required for running the leisure contracts as detailed in Table 3 of the report; and
- In the event of a redundancy (which was considered to be a low risk) details would be reported to the Joint Appointments and Implementation Committee

In response to a further question and after noting the comment made in bullet point 5 of paragraph 23 of the report concerning the most appropriate section to manage the Open Space Strategy needing to be the subject of further consideration, the Joint Committee agreed that the reference to the Strategy in Appendix 3 – High Level Implementation Plan – should be deleted.

RECOMMENDED	
1.	That the case for a joint Community Service is proven and that both Councils proceed to establish a joint Community Service.
2.	That staff in the respective Community services can be shared to work across the two local authority areas.
AND RESOLVED	
3.	That the joint Community service to be implemented should be as described in Section 5 of the report which proposes co-location of the service at King George V House and as the structure and job titles as shown in Appendix 2.
4.	That the cost sharing arrangements set out in the financial benefits section (Section 5) of the report which recommends that the cost split accords with the IAA be agreed
5.	That the high level implementation plan (Appendix 3) as amended to delete reference to the Open Space Strategy be agreed as the basis for reviewing progress in line with delegations and responsibilities decided for the implementation phase of the service review.
6.	That the potential full year savings of circa £101K be taken account of in the

Authorities' respective financial plans as previously agreed as part of the management restructure linked to this review.

6. **BUSINESS CASE FOR A SHARED PLANNING POLICY SERVICE**

Paragraph 3 – Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particularly person (including the authority holding that information)

The Joint Committee received a report setting out the result of a shared service review of Planning Policy. The report detailed the business case, the conclusion of which was that the case for a joint service had been proven and therefore that a shared service with one manager and two teams one located at Capswood and the other at King George V House, Amersham., should be established. The proposed joint service would deliver greater resilience, improve service quality, increase capacity and net savings.

The Joint Committee also received a report of the Director of Services advising of the views expressed at the Members Working Group, including the view that there was currently no support for a joint local plan for the two authorities, a view which the Joint Committee endorsed.

In connection with the net savings, the Joint Committee agreed that, in the light of the additional information provided at the meeting relating to staff costs, the Member Working Group should be requested to review the cost sharing arrangements together with the potential savings.

RECOMMENDED	
1.	That the case for a joint Planning Policy service is proven and that both Councils proceed to establish a joint Planning Policy Service.
2.	That staff in the respective Planning Policy services can be shared to work across the two local authority areas.
3	That the decision to request the Member Working Group to review the cost sharing arrangements and the potential savings be noted and authority be delegated to the Chief Executive, in consultation with the Leaders and relevant Portfolio Holders from each authority, to make any adjustments to the business case in the light of the report back from the Member Working Group.
AND RESOLVED	
4.	That the joint Planning Policy Service to be implemented should be as described in Section 4 of the report which proposes a shared service with one manager and two teams one located at Capswood and the other located at King George V House, Amersham on the understanding that even if the two teams were both to prepare new Local Plans to a similar timescale dealing with issues common to both authorities there would be no intention to move to a single team.
5.	That the Member Working Group be asked to review the cost split and the potential savings with a report back to the Chief Executive.
6.	That the high level implementation plan (Appendix 3) be agreed as the basis for reviewing progress in line with delegations and responsibilities decided for the implementation phase of the service review.

--	--

The meeting terminated at 6.03 pm