

**MINUTES** of the meeting of the **CORPORATE OVERVIEW SELECT COMMITTEE** held at 10.00 am on 20 September 2018 at Ashcombe Suite, County Hall, Kingston upon Thames, Surrey KT1 2DN.

These minutes are subject to confirmation by the Committee at its meeting on Thursday, 25 October 2018.

**Elected Members:**

- \* Mr Ken Gulati (Chairman)
- \* Ms Ayesha Azad
- \* Mr Mark Brett-Warburton
- \* Mr Tim Evans
- \* Mr Tim Hall
- \* Mr David Harmer
- \* Mr Nick Harrison (Vice-Chairman)
- \* Mr Keith Witham
- \* Mr Chris Botten
- \* Mr Richard Walsh

\*= present

**In attendance**

David Hodge, Leader of the Council  
John Furey, Deputy Leader of the Council, Cabinet Member for Economic Prosperity  
Denise Turner-Stewart, Cabinet Member for Community Services

**1 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS [Item 1]**

Apologies were received from Helyn Clack, Lead Cabinet Member for Corporate Support.

**2 MINUTES OF THE OVERVIEW AND BUDGET SCRUTINY COMMITTEE: 17 MAY 2018 [Item 2]**

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

**3 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 3]**

There were no declarations of interest made.

**4 QUESTIONS & PETITIONS [Item 4]**

There were no questions and petitions submitted to the Committee.

**5 VISION FOR SURREY 2030 [Item 5]**

**Witnesses:**

David Hodge, Leader of the Council  
Michael Coughlin, Executive Director for Customers, Digital and Transformation

Louise Footner, Head of Communications

**Key points raised during the discussion:**

1. The Committee were presented with the Vision for Surrey 2030. Officers highlighted that this was the most extensive engagement with residents and partners to date. The Head of Communications confirmed that the service had received over 3,000 online and paper responses which were considered to be statistically robust. It was noted that representatives from various hard to reach groups such as those with certain disabilities, LGBT groups and young people had been contacted. Members further noted that the Vision for Surrey 2030 had been amended to reflect the views received during the consultation.
2. The Executive Director for Customers, Digital and Transformation provided Members with further detail on what the engagement feedback had shown. It was stated, that in order to provide residents with better services stronger partnership working relationships were required. The timescales within the vision had been amended to reflect what had been learnt.
3. It was confirmed that those who chose to take part in the engagement exercise did so on a self-selection basis. The Head of Communications reassured Members that she felt confident there had been a statistically significant response and that efforts had been made to engage with a variety of people. In comparison to other County Councils, Surrey County Council's engagement exercise had received a high number of responses.
4. Members asked which services residents valued the least when responding to the engagement questionnaire. Officers confirmed that this had not been asked of respondents. In the context of prioritising outcomes for 2030 the least popular statements selected by residents were: 'People to benefit from sustainable development and growth', 'Communities to be inclusive', 'Businesses to thrive' and 'Having access to information and services to reduce need in support'.
5. Members felt positive about the number of responses received to the engagement and asked if any District and Borough resident consultation panels had been contacted for a response. The Head of Communications confirmed that all Districts and Boroughs had been contacted but that the extent to which they may have used their own local panels was not known.
6. Members sought clarification on the methodology of the engagement exercise and queried why it was undertaken in-house rather than using a third party company. Officers explained that contracting with a specialised research company would have taken much more time and been more costly than the in-house approach.
7. When discussing what was gained from the exercise, Officers explained that the Council had not previously engaged residents in such a way before, therefore all the information gained was seen to be significant and would be used to shape the future of the county. While

clearly a Vision for Surrey, the place, it was noted that the process of engagement had allowed residents to become more aware of the services the Council provided.

8. Members supported the concept of 'Deal(s)' with residents and the importance of gaining buy-in, support and involvement from them. When asked if trust was needed to be built within the county between partners, officers explained that parts of the organisation needed to be better at building positive working relations with partners. When speaking with partners the idea of improving relationships was welcomed but work still needed to be done to secure these relationships.
9. The Committee agreed that the knowledge gained from the engagement was significant and asked that it be shared with relevant partners for their information.
10. Members highlighted details in the supplementary agenda which confirmed that residents understood the impact of reductions in central government funding but they also wanted the organisation to make sure it was focusing on spending money on the most important services. Officers went on to explain that more information was needed on what was considered to be an 'important service' and that the Council would continue to seek joint solutions for better outcomes.
11. There was a discussion around the potential for another engagement exercise in the future. Officers confirmed that ongoing resident engagement took place through resident surveys that reviewed residents' views. There was also an intention to establish a standing Surrey CC residents' panel.
12. The Leader of the Council highlighted the importance of Members reviewing services and residents' needs strategically. The Committee were also informed that the Leader of the Council would be speaking at the Surrey Leader's Group to discuss cooperation and delivering services.

**Resolved:**

- The Committee noted the Vision for Surrey 2030 and requested that the Vision for Surrey 2030 and engagement report be shared with relevant partners for information.

**6 EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC [Item 6]**

That under Section 100(A) of the Local Government Act 1972, the public be excluded from the meeting during consideration of the following items of business on the grounds that they involve the likely disclosure of exempt information under the relevant paragraphs of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Act.

## 7 TRANSFORMATION FULL BUSINESS CASES [Item 7]

### Witnesses:

Denise Turner-Stewart, Cabinet Member for Community Services  
David Hodge, Leader of the Council  
John Furey, Deputy Leader of the Council, Cabinet Member for Economic Prosperity  
Michael Coughlin, Executive Director for Customers, Digital and Transformation

### Key points raised during the discussion:

1. The Committee formally scrutinised Part 2 business cases that support the Council's transformation programme. Members were, in general, supportive of each of the business cases considered. The Committee discussed in detail the investment needed and financial benefits arising from each business case. There was scrutiny around the risks associated with each business case and measures in place to mitigate these.

*Denise Turner-Stewart left the meeting at 11.00am*

2. There was a recognition by Members that a significant amount of work was needed to increase the robustness of the Council's financial resilience and planning. There was also a recognition that for a programme of transformation to be successful a cultural shift to new ways of working was crucial.

### Resolved:

### The Committee:

- a) Supported the drive to transform the Council's services and, importantly, its culture to become sustainable,
- b) Noted the interdependencies between the transformation projects and the importance of the enabling projects in delivering savings, for example digital and performance management in other service directorates,
- c) Emphasised the risks to the organisation of not implementing the business cases in terms of budget deficits and the outcomes for service users and residents,
- d) Highlights the particular risk of double counting the financial benefits to the Council across the various business cases,
- e) Recommended that Select Committees review the planning and implementation of the business cases relevant to their remits on the basis of value and risk following the Council decision in November 2018,
- f) Recommended that there are clear measures of success and milestones for Select Committees to test the outcomes of each transformation project.

[E-157-18] Exempt minute

**8 FORWARD WORK PROGRAMME AND TASK GROUP SCOPING [Item 8]**

**Key points raised during the discussion:**

1. The Committee sought confirmation on the expectations for budget scrutiny at its meeting on 25 October 2018. Officers confirmed that details of budget scrutiny would be circulated to Members following an officer meeting with the Interim Director of Finance in the week commencing 24 September 2018.
2. Members discussed the need for a Modern Councillor item at its Committee meeting in November 2018. It was noted that the Modern Councillor project had an in-year savings target attached to it therefore the Committee would discuss the project's impacts and outcomes.
3. Following a suggestion Members were advised to not merge the 'Effectiveness of Scrutiny' and 'Modern Councillor Project' items due to the variance between the subjects. It was however suggested that a joint conclusion may be produced at the meeting.

**Resolved:**

- The Committee reviewed and agreed its forward work programme.
- The Committee approved the scoping document for the Out of County Children's Placements Task And Finish Group.

**9 DATE OF THE NEXT MEETING [Item 9]**

The Committee noted its next meeting would be held on 25 October 2018.

Meeting ended at: 3.25 pm

---

**Chairman**

This page is intentionally left blank