

MINUTES of the meeting of the **COMMUNITIES SELECT COMMITTEE** held at 10.00 am on 21 November 2012 at Ashcombe Suite, County Hall, Kingston upon Thames, Surrey KT1 2DN.

These minutes are subject to confirmation by the Committee at its meeting on Wednesday, 16 January 2013.

Elected Members:

- * Mr Steve Cosser (Chairman)
- * Mr Mike Bennison
- A Mr Graham Ellwood
- * Mrs Angela Fraser
- * Denis Fuller
- * Mr David Ivison
- * Mrs Jan Mason
- * Mr Chris Norman (Deputy Chairman)
- * Mr John Orrick
- * Mr Michael Sydney
- * Mr Colin Taylor
- * Mr David Wood

Ex officio Members:

- * Mrs Lavinia Sealy, Chairman of the County Council
- Mr David Munro, Vice Chairman of the County Council

54/12 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS [Item 1]

Apologies were received from Graham Ellwood and Helyn Clack (Cabinet Member for Community Services & the 2012 Games). There were no substitutions.

55/12 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETINGS: 12 JULY 2012 & 16 AUGUST 2012 [Item 2]

The minutes were agreed as an accurate record of the meeting.

56/12 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 3]

There were no declarations of interests.

57/12 QUESTIONS AND PETITIONS [Item 4]

There were no questions or petitions.

58/12 RECOMMENDATION TRACKER AND FORWARD WORK PROGRAMME [Item 5]

Declarations of interest:

None.

Witnesses:

None.

Key points raised during the discussion:

1. The Committee were informed that the Engagement with High Need Areas in Surrey Task Group has been deferred until after May 2013 in order to enable the work to be completed to an appropriate level of detail.

Actions/further information to be provided:

None.

Recommendations:

None.

Select Committee next steps:

None.

59/12 RESPONSES FROM THE CABINET TO ISSUES REFERRED BY THE SELECT COMMITTEE [Item 6]

The Committee made no referrals to Cabinet so there are no responses to report.

60/12 FIRE AND RESCUE SERVICE ADVISORY GROUP (FRAG) [Item 7]

Declarations of interest:

None.

Witnesses:

None.

Key points raised during the discussion:

1. Following an agenda item at the Communities Select Committee meeting on 12 July 2012 the Chairman had prepared a report proposing a clarification of the arrangements between FRAG and the Communities Select Committee. Three recommendations were being proposed with the intention that they would emphasise the importance of effective scrutiny arrangements, while also aiming to reduce any duplication of work between the Committee and FRAG.
2. Members of the Committee discussed concerns about the potential for an divide between advice for the Cabinet Member and advice for Select Committee. The Chairman said that the intention behind the recommendations was to ensure that there was transparency in the decision making and scrutiny process. Notes were kept during the FRAG meetings and these would be available to the Communities Select Committee.

Actions/further information to be provided:

None.

Recommendations:

- a) That the Cabinet Member for Community Safety is requested to share the following information regarding FRAG on a regular basis:
 - a. Any changes of membership
 - b. All report papers for meetings
 - c. Any significant changes such as changes of terms of reference
- b) That due to the elements of duplication between the Members' Reference Group and FRAG in terms of both focusing on the Public Safety Plan and surrounding issues of this Plan, it is recommended that the Members' Reference Group ceases and issues on progress and implementation of the Public Safety Plan are directed to the Select Committee on a periodic basis for scrutiny.
- c) That this report be presented to the Select Committee Chairman's Group for information and any comments.

Select Committee next steps:

None.

61/12 COMMUNITY PARTNERSHIPS PUBLIC VALUE REVIEW [Item 8]

Declarations of interest:

None.

Witnesses:

Mark Irons Head of Customer Services & Customers and Communities
 Directorate Support

Key points raised during the discussion:

1. The Committee were informed about the outcomes of the Community Partnerships Public Value Review (PVR). The PVR had set out the importance of flexibility in the proposed framework, which will enable Local Committees to adopt the model which best suits their local circumstances.
2. Members discussed concerns that the PVR had proposals around development of a Joint Committee model and particular anxieties around this being imposed on Local Committees. The lead officer on the PVR outlined that the proposal was based on Member Reference Group feedback. The intention behind the proposal was to enable those Local Committees who wished to implement the Joint Committee model to do so. The Committee recognised that there was a clear emphasis on enabling flexible models for Local Committees and that this would enable them to undertake their work with a greater efficacy.
3. Members acknowledged that District and Borough representatives could enhance discussion within Local Committees as they bring a more local perspective. It was stated that there was scope to develop a greater sense of partnership however there would also need to be a suitable provision to ensure the partnership was a suitably mutual one. The Committee recognised the need to reconsider the role of District and Borough representatives in relation to voting rights and contribution of resources and services.
4. The Committee discussed the role of Local Committee meetings in presenting an opportunity to showcase the work done by the County Council. It was recognised that in some cases resident engagement and attendance could be improved and that this could be stimulated by providing extra resource to publicise the work of the Committees. The Committee discussed the need to ensure that public expectation was set appropriately around the role of the Local Committees and how best they could engage with the process.
5. The Committee acknowledged that there were clear links between the Community Partnerships PVR and the Localism Task Group Report. It

was expressed that the PVR's recommendations were welcomed and officers were praised for their work on preparing the report.

Actions/further information to be provided:

None.

Recommendations:

- a) That now that the Community Partnership PVR has concluded, promised discussions (from the April 2012 Cabinet meeting which considered the Localism Task Group report), are initiated between the portfolio holder, the Chairman of the Select Committee and officers to enable the Task Group recommendations also to be taken forward.
- b) The importance of retaining the flexibility of the Local Committee structures as outlined in the PVR Report is taken forward and supported.
- c) That discussions are facilitated with District and Borough partners to consider which of their services and resources could come under the umbrella of the Local Committees with a view to promoting a more unified local approach.
- d) That further consideration should be given to the resources available to Local Committees, particularly around communications and media, for example through release of resource from the centre or as part of the One Team Review of Communications.

Select Committee next steps:

None.

62/12 CULTURAL SERVICES PUBLIC VALUE REVIEW [Item 9]

Declarations of interest:

None.

Witnesses:

Susie Kemp Assistant Chief Executive
Peter Milton Head of Cultural Services

Lavinia Sealy Chairman of the Council

Key points raised during the discussion:

- 1. The Committee were informed that the Cultural Services PVR report had combined three strands of work being undertaken by the following PVRs: Surrey Arts, Heritage Service and Adult and Community Learning. It had been felt that while there had been a great deal of positive work on the individual PVRs there had also been a great deal

of commonality. The Assistant Chief Executive expressed the view that that she wished to reassure Members that the detail of the individual strands would not be lost in the wider context of the work going forward.

2. The Head of Cultural Services outlined that the Service Improvement Plan for Cultural Services would provide more specialised analysis. Member Reference Groups would continue to be a very active part of the process.
3. Concern was expressed by some Members over the potential move to unite all cultural activity and services under one business model. It was felt that this had the potential to create an adverse impact on the quality and specialism of individual services. Music was highlighted as a particular example. It was also outlined that there was a need to think about how services operated on a local level, as well as in a County-wide sense.
4. Members felt that Surrey's strategy on tourism was unclear and it was agreed that this was an area which required further consideration.
5. It was noted that there was a need for clarity about the creation of a new 'cultural hub,' as it was not apparent whether this referred to a new location and/or a virtual offer. Officers outlined that there was a dual concept being developed in both a physical and virtual sense. The intention to look at the feasibility of a cultural hub was partly guided by the need to relocate Surrey Arts.
6. Members reiterated the need to raise the profile and awareness of the good work highlighted by the Cultural Services PVR. Cultural Services were praised for its ability to offer considerable public value by the Committee. It was further stated the need to ensure that these specific positives were not lost in the continuing development of the service.

Actions/further information to be provided:

None.

Recommendations:

- a) That arrangements are put in place to ensure that the high quality and good practices within small but excellent services are not lost in a combined Cultural Service.
- b) That Members continue to be involved through Member Reference Groups in the development and recommendations of the individual PVRs as well as in monitoring the combined Cultural Services PVR.

Select Committee next steps:

None.

63/12 DATE OF NEXT MEETING [Item 10]

The Committee noted that the next meeting of the Committee would be on 16 January 2013.

Meeting ended at: 12.14 pm

Chairman