

Minutes of the Camden Local Strategic Partnership
Thursday 29 November 2007 at 10.30 am at Camden Town Hall

Present

Name	Organisation represented
Simone Hensby (SH)	Camden Community Empowerment Network , Chair and Rep of Voluntary Action Camden
Charlie Legg (CL)	Camden Community Empowerment Network Rep of Camden Central Community Umbrella
Barry Peskin (BP)	Camden Community Empowerment Network , Vice Chair and Rep of Age Concern Camden
Pat Stack (PS)	Camden Community Empowerment Network , Rep of Disability in Camden
Karen Wilson (KW)	Camden Housing Association and Co-op Forum , Chair (Group Chief Executive, Origin Group)
Rob Larkman (RL)	Camden Primary Care Trust , Chief Executive
Chris Shaw (CS)	Camden Town Unlimited , Chair
Alistair Subba Row (ASR)	The Holborn Partnership , Board Member (Managing Partners, Farebrother)
Mick Hickey (MHi)	Job Centre Plus , External Relations Manager - Central London District
Dorothea Hackman (DH) (Vice Chair of LSP)	Joint Chairs of Governors
Richard Bell (RB)	Learning and Skills Council , Partnership Director
Stephen Jordan (SJ)	London & Continental Stations and Property , Managing Director
Moira Gibb (MG)	London Borough of Camden , Chief Executive,
Cllr Andrew Marshall (AM)	London Borough of Camden , Deputy Leader of the Council and Executive Member for Equalities and Community Development
Cllr KEITH MOFFITT ((Chair of LSP)	London Borough of Camden , Leader
Michael Quy (MQ)	London Fire & Emergency Planning Authority , Borough Commander
Chief Supt Mark Heath (MH)	Metropolitan Police , Borough Commander

Also in Attendance	
Pamela Hamilton	Audit Commission, Inspector for the Corporate Assessment
Donna Turnbull	Camden Community Empowerment Network
Louise Matlock (LM)	Government Office for London, Locality Manager - North
Cllr Arthur Graves	London Borough of Camden FROM ITEM 7
Michael Scorer	London Borough of Camden, Assistant Chief Executive
Gerri Scott (GS)	London Borough of Camden, Assistant Director - Community Development and Regeneration
Dean Stokes (DS)	London Borough of Camden, Head of Strategy and Policy
Claire Tunley (CT)	London Borough of Camden, Policy Manager LAA and LSP
Michael Webb	London Borough of Camden, Senior Policy Officer
Jarlath O'Connell	London Borough of Camden, Senior Policy Officer – LSP and Partnerships
Det Insp Jeremy Burston	Metropolitan Police
Maureen Brewster (MB)	Voluntary Action Camden

1. INTRODUCTION AND APOLOGIES

1.1 Apologies for absence were received from Anthony Kessel.

2. MEMBERSHIP

2.1 The Chair stated that Anthony Kessel had absented himself from this meeting as the LSP was considering his nomination for membership. The Chair stated that he was very pleased to nominate Prof Kessel because he had been a regular contributor to the LSP in the past and that he and Rob Larkman were of the view that it was an anomaly that Prof Kessel was not a member, considering he was the borough's Director of Public Health as well as Chair of the Camden Public Health Partnership and Chair of the Drug and Alcohol Action Team.

2.2 The LSP unanimously approved the nomination.

The LSP:

- **Elected Professor Anthony Kessel as a member of the LSP.**

3. CAMDEN'S LOCAL AREA AGREEMENT

3.1 Claire Tunley introduced this report, noting that it was in three sections

- (a) 2007/8 LAA – six month performance review
- (b) 2007/8 LAA – quarter 2 financial report
- (c) 2008/9 LAA – draft priorities for the new look LAA

2007/8 LAA – six month performance review

She noted that there remained some data collection issues, which had skewed the reporting of some statistics e.g. numbers of young people not in employment, education or training.

3.2 The Chair raised a concern about outcome 21.4, the percentage of residents without qualifications. Gerri Scott replied that this was a major concern of the Economic Development Partnership who monitor this closely and that it would need to be looked at in more depth. The BME employment rate was also at a standstill however there were now specific initiatives such as the estate based employment initiatives to help tackle this issue.

3.3 Richard Bell added that the LSC was working closely with Government Office for London and the borough to align the data they had on this and that there were concerns about areas such as St Pancras, Kilburn and Gospel Oak where there

were real pockets of resistance to the take up of skills provision. There was a need for providers to work more closely on tackling this he added.

- 3.4 Mick Hickey added that Job Centre Plus was working to refocus its efforts in Camden to identify clients who were not responding to the traditional routes to employment. Job Centre Plus was re-packaging their offer to ensure a greater take up by clients.
- 3.5 Cllr Marshall stated that he welcomed the reduction in the crime figures and that while there was a significant drop in the unemployment rate in key wards there were still challenges such as the BME employment rate. He added that in the next set of targets there should be an emphasis on 'super output areas' as it was necessary to focus down as far as possible in order to begin to tackle problems of worklessness.
- 3.6 Mark Heath welcomed the latest 2% reduction in crime and the fact that Camden would end up with a 26% reduction in the overall crime rate against the 2003/4 baseline. One of the challenges for the borough he added was the massive footfall (number of daily visitors) and the better data was needed on whether those committing crimes were local or from outside the borough. He added that targets needed to be set within a proper context and it was agreed that this issue would be addressed in greater detail at the Community Safety Partnership.
- Action: Community Safety Partnership**
- 3.7 Rob Larkman welcomed the improved performance on reduction of smoking. He added that the wrong direction of travel for indicator 24.1 (4 week smoking quitters attending NHS smoking cessation services) was likely to be seasonal and that this trend would probably be reversed after Christmas.
- 3.8 With reference to 3.14 of the report Barry Peskin expressed concern about the potential impact of newly introduced home care charging policy would have on the Direct Payment figures as users may cancel their services, as the charge would equal the payment they receive. He stated that this change was short sighted and that the longer term consequences would be a worsening of the situation of many vulnerable older people who were likely to become an even greater burden on social services. Pat Stack echoed these points adding that as a result of these changes many who would opt out of the care services would be employing people privately, paying cash in hand and workers and clients would not be protected legally. The Chair replied that he had had a number of discussions with the Executive Member for Adult Social Care and Health, Cllr Martin Davies and that there would be adjustments on the payments of disability related benefit. Rob Larkman added that it was important that this issue be resolved satisfactorily, otherwise there would be an adverse impact on services. Moira Gibb added that this issue had come about because of the national drive to "right size" the social care budget and that the intention here had been to ensure that services were targeted at a wider range of people. She stated that adult

social care and health provision were a major challenge for the council and its partners. PS added that while he understood this the direction of travel for social care funding over the past five years had been quite unfavourable for service users. Those with low and moderate care needs had suffered cuts and these were now extending to those with a high need. The Chair concluded by requesting that this issue be brought back to the LSP on charging for social care provision because of the levels of concern.

Action: Claire Tunley

- 3.9 With reference to point 3.21 of the report BP asked why the council was proceeding with the creation of Area Forums while there were Neighbourhood Partnerships in place. In his view Area Forums would produce a skewed opinion in favour of white middle class males and there was a need for the Council to listen to a more diverse range of voices in order to get a more realistic picture of the borough. The Chair replied that in setting up the Area Forums officers had been very conscious that they be representative and not include the “usual suspects”, adding that a number of regular voices had already complained to him of being left out. A conscious decision had been made to make them ward based and everyone involved was working hard to ensure that they were inclusive. Cllr Marshall added that Neighbourhood Partnerships only covered 30% of the borough whereas Area Forums were borough wide. They were also councillor led and not a big budget item for the council. He stated that while he understood the concern about the end of NRF funding it was hoped that the “Working Neighbourhood Fund” would go some way towards replacing it.
- 3.10 With reference to point 3.26 of the report Charlie Legg took issue with the inference that there were capacity difficulties particularly among the voluntary and community sector (VCS) partners in delivering on outcomes. CT responded that this referred to direct report back from some projects. CL replied that VCS in particular suffered from the late arrival of funding and didn’t accept that the VCS should be singled out in this way. The Chair asked officers to provide more information to the CEN representatives on the background to this comment.

Action: Claire Tunley

(b) 2007/8 LAA – Quarter 2 financial report

- 3.11 CT introduced this report. She pointed out that nearly £600K of quarter 2 payments were processed in October and will be reported in quarter 3 and so spend is 11% below profile. She stated that this delay could be traced to the late arrival again of funding for the Safer and Stronger Communities themes.
- 3.12 In response to questions from members CT clarified the procedures in place for handling underspend. It was noted that a decision was awaited on from government on whether underspend could be carried forward and what the processes would be and that she was fairly confident that carry forward would be allowed. Louise Matlock confirmed that a decision had not yet been made on

these points. RL asked why the £600K underspend couldn't be accrued into the full Statement. CT replied that this was because of the financial reporting rules under which the LAA operated. She re-iterated that all of the funding had been contracted. The Chair stated that a process for handling underspend had been put in place last year so this was not unfamiliar.

- 3.13 Stephen Jordan enquired if contingency authorities were already in place to allow priorities to be earmarked for use of underspend. This would allow for speedy decisions on underspend to be made if necessary. CT replied that this issue was monitored closely by the LAA Steering Group and his comments would be taken on board by the group.

Action: Claire Tunley

2008/9 LAA – draft priorities for the new look LAA

- 3.14 CT introduced the report and reminded members that a new LAA was on the horizon. It would now be a set of targets and there would be no more specific LAA funds. She asked for members comments on the “long list” of LAA priorities as outlined in the report.
- 3.15 The Chair stated that he hoped the LSP could be ambitious in its targets. He stated that he had met with Mick Quay and colleagues from the London Fire and Emergency Planning Authority who had requested some fire related indicators in the new LAA. CT replied that the national set of indicators was very wide ranging and outcomes based and just because something wasn't in the LAA it didn't mean it would not be monitored or still receive attention.
- 3.16 Dorothea Hackman stated that in terms of education and training priorities she was hoping to see a target for numeracy as per the 'London Skills for Life' Strategy. She also hoped that that this target would address the issue of meeting local employers needs. CT replied that we would be restricted by what was in the national indicator set. DH responded that if there are one million Londoners with insufficient numeracy skills how would this be tracked in Camden adding that lack of numeracy skills was a major bar to employment. She added that the targets should also attempt to address local employer needs and she said she was disappointed that the 14-19 target was still just focused on NEETS (those not in employment, education or training). RB re-iterated that the real focus must be on tackling hot spot areas. MH talked about the link between lack of basic skills, worklessness and crime and stressed the need to ensure partners don't work in isolation on tackling these.
- 3.17 Cllr Marshall stated that a skills target was essential but care needed to be taken to ensure it was the right one. He added that the business priorities as currently outlined did not focus enough on medium and small sized businesses. He expressed surprise that the area of least overlap with Whitehall priorities was with DEFRA's priorities on sustainability. The Chair added that this illustrated the

need for some local targets when national targets were unsuitable for our purposes.

- 3.18 Karen Wilson suggested that there was a need for a target in the Housing area which specifically related to planning performance.
- 3.19 Chris Shaw suggested that there was a need for a target on retention of existing businesses as this was just as important as creating new businesses.
- 3.20 CT thanked members for their suggestions and stated that the next step was to produce a short list. A lot of discussions had already taken place with partners in beginning to trim down the long list and it was important to get a good mix and not to leave any narrow priorities isolated. The four thematic partnerships were also considering the list and aligning it with the strategies, most of which were in the process of being reviewed. The LSP would be sent further refinements and the process would be handled both by correspondence and at the next two business meetings.
- 3.21 MG stated that the issue now was not to put more targets in but to revise those we already have to ensure we get them right. There would of course be areas where work would continue which are not included and it was important not to see the LAA as some kind of self denying ordinance.
- 3.22 RL stated that as a member of the Children and Young Peoples Partnership Board he saw a great deal of synergy between the thematic partnerships and the LSP in agreeing these priorities and that the cross membership should ensure CYPPB priorities are not overlooked in the final LAA. He added that targets mean different things to different people and that the key issue was which indicators were used. In the health sphere they were now used to operating under a number of parallel performance management frameworks and they were for example awaiting publication of the NHS's Operational Framework for next year. This would of course impact on the indicators they would wish to have included in the LAA.
- 3.23 RL asked if a target on inequalities in life expectancy in the borough could definitely be included as this was already a major priority in the PCTs own commissioning strategy.
- 3.24 SH stated that she welcomed the reference to thriving third sector and enquired about the connection between the long list and the national indicator set. CT clarified that the long list was Camden's articulation of what needed to be taken from the national set to ensure delivery of the commitments in the community strategy. SH stated that the concern of the VCS was that they be fully involved in the agreement of the detail of the indicators. CT replied that the VCS were involved in the LAA steering group and that the process would be fully inclusive.

- 3.25 SJ suggested that the absence of pump priming grants and a funding element to the LAA might hinder how the new LAA develops and partners would need to be mindful not to be forced back into silos. He suggested that each partner would be reserving their judgement in light of their own priorities and this would be the challenge for partnership working. The Chair added that the uncertainty about what might replace NRF funding would add a level of anxiety. CT reminded that the LAA had always been only a small percentage of the total public service spend in the borough and the new look LAA would focus on the totality of funds coming into Camden. The priority would be to look at how an LAA can add value regardless of the source of the funding.
- 3.26 BP expressed concern that targets to deal with alcohol misuse and its impact were not sufficiently reflected in the list. He stated that there were at 9 areas of the list where alcohol and its impact could be included and that an important opportunity was being missed. The Chair reminded him that alcohol was included under the “thriving and safe” section and that his frequent requests on this point were being heeded. RL replied that the Drug and Alcohol Action Team were taking this issue very seriously and MH added that there was a lot of partnership work going on with community safety partners on licensing issues and enforcement. He stated that the sheer breadth of activity of a partnership such as Community Safety Partnership could never be fully reflected in this list.
- 3.27 MH commented that while there had been a welcome reduction in the crime statistics it was important to put the focus on the wider causes of crime and to work more closely with partners on all the cross cutting issues.
- 3.28 CL expressed a concern about the lack of overlap with the Whitehall priorities on recycling, child care and gangs and weapons. CT replied that recycling was on the long list and that gangs and weapons were not high priority in this context. MH replied that you could not map all police activity onto this list because of the breadth of work being done. The Chair stated that it was a matter of emphasis and how that emphasis was articulated. Louise Matlock confirmed that the list of Whitehall priorities for Camden reflected a national agenda and where government wanted Camden to focus as well as areas of poor performance. Cllr Marshall reminded the group that everything couldn't be a priority and this was a balancing exercise. He stated that he was not concerned if there was some imbalance between the government list and local priorities and that the government would expect each borough to be distinctive and local.

The LSP:

- **Noted the progress on the 2007/8 LAA in the first six months of 2007/8**
- **Noted the actions to address areas of underperformance in the 2007/8 LAA**
- **Noted the information on quarter 2 expenditure for 2007/8**

- **Agreed that the overall theme of the 2008/9 LAA would be “Borough of Opportunity”**
- **Agreed the long list of 2008/9 LAA priorities as detailed in appendix C**
- **Delegated responsibility for 2008/9 LAA negotiations to the Leader of the Council, taking advice from the LAA Steering Group and the Chair of the LAA Steering Group.**

4. UPDATING THE *COMPACT FOR CAMDEN*

- 4.1 SH introduced this report stating that the purpose of reviewing the Compact was to look at how the various public sector partners can work together better and add value. This report gave examples of how the Compact works in practice and SH introduced her colleague Maureen Brewster from Voluntary Action Camden who described two of the projects listed in the report.
- 4.2 Maureen Brewster described how the Compact had informed and complemented the work of the Community Partnership Project, involving eight London boroughs and which looked at honour violence, child trafficking, spirit possession and female genital mutilation. She said that Camden alone had a representative to this group who was from the VCS rather than from the statutory sector and this was testament to the quality of work carried out in Camden and the fact that effective partnership working was already in place.
- 4.3 MB also described how the Compact had informed and complemented the ‘Developing Race Equality in Mental Healthcare’ plan for tackling inequalities in services and care for BME groups. She described how, for example, as part of the VCS work with Somali youths, positive links had been made with the police and this had resulted in the project having a much wider impact than had been originally anticipated.
- 4.4 MB added that the Compact wasn’t effective when an initiative was seen as an extension of an existing service and there was no perceived added value. There were of course challenges to the implementation of the Compact around such issues as time, resources, performance management and shared outcomes.
- 4.5 SH stated that the Compact was helping to embed good partnership working across the public, private and third sectors and a good example of late was the bid for the “community assets” funding put together by LB Camden, the VCS, Origin Housing and some private sector organisations.
- 4.6 BP suggested that in point 5.2 (bullet point 13) in the Compact should be amended to read:

“Equality of access and equality of opportunity and equity in delivery of outcomes”.

This was referred to the Compact Group for consideration.

Action: Compact Group

- 4.7 KW asked if there would be an opportunity to input comments to the proposed revision of the text and SH stated that the Compact Group would be meeting on 10 January 2008 to update the document and would welcome input from LSP members. She reminded them that junior colleagues of all the LSP public sector partners sat on the Compact Group and asked that all responses be fed through these. She added that all relevant parties would be welcome to attend the meeting when the new draft would be discussed.
- 4.8 Cllr Marshall stated that he welcomed this work and the fact that this Compact was in place and well established. He was pleased that the Group was now meeting regularly and asked that a brief monitoring report on the work of the Compact Group would continue to be presented to the LSP once a year.
- 4.9 Members agreed all the recommendations as set out in the report:

The LSP:

- **Noted the progress on the Compact, as outlined in item 2 of the report.**
- **Noted that the Compact Group welcomed proposed amendments to the document prior to its meeting on 10 January 2008.**
- **Re-affirmed the LSP's commitment to the Compact.**
- **Agreed that all members of the LSP:**
 - (a) continue to champion the Compact within their own organisations.**
 - (b) confirm an operational lead and contact point for the Compact within their own organisations.**
 - (c) ensure that all lead officers for the community strategy are aware of the Compact and how it operates.**
 - (d) ensure that all future reports on the progress of the Community Strategy make reference to and illustrate partnership working with the voluntary and community sector where possible.**

5. CAMDEN'S COMMUNITY STRATEGY: *CAMDEN TOGETHER 2007-2012*

- 5.1 GS introduced the report and detailed the Community Strategy commitments which were being reported on in this first report on *Camden Together*. She stressed the vital role the VCS plays in delivering on this particular set of commitments particularly in the area of increasing the % of those volunteering in the borough. She stated that the Social Cohesion Forum had made a good start and that its discussions were being guided by the recommendations of the Commission on Integration and Cohesion's recent report - "Our Shared Futures".

She reported that the recommendation that single group funding for community groups should be an exception was one which was accepted in Camden as there was a firm view that all Camden services/facilities had to be inclusive. She concluded that the Stronger Communities theme in the LAA was focused on how the borough can develop its social capital.

- 5.2 CL stated that the CEN board had had a long discussion on this report and expressed some concern that how the way in which money would meet objectives would become less transparent. He stated that achieving these commitments would not be easy and that the report did not acknowledge the role that the VCS can really play. He stated that strengthening the role of the VCS would help the LSP deliver on these commitments.
- 5.3 DH stated that she applauded the involvement of service users and asked how their impact can be measured. Cllr Marshall stated that the commissioning criteria for the had LAA greatly helped to break down barriers to partnership working. He also added that the voluntary sector needed to be looked at in the broadest sense and illustrated how for example he had recently attended a meeting of the Belsize Residents Association, where there were 100 active participants. The Chair added that it was voluntary organisations such as these, feeding into the Area Forums which illustrate how the process of engagement can grow from the bottom up. MG reminded the LSP that that Camden spent more than any comparable borough on its VCS and greatly valued the contribution they make.
- 5.4 Dean Stokes stated that the final shape of the LAA would determine the funding to be received. CL replied that the concern was not about the targets but about the means of achieving them. GS responded that the VCS was already delivering in a whole number of areas as part of the current LAA and this would continue.
- 5.5 DS added that it was too early to assess the performance of Area Forums against any targets but that following the completion of two rounds of meetings it would be possible to then make an assessment of their progress. SH enquired if they were decision making or advisory and DS clarified that their role was to influence decision making. The Chair added that part of the rationale behind Area Forums was the concept that many residents wanted to have a role in influencing major decisions rather than just the ability to make small decisions.
- 5.6 The Chair thanked GS and DS for their report and asked if in future agendas more time could be set aside for these particular discussions.

Action: Claire Tunley

The LSP:

- **Noted the report.**

6. PROGRESS REPORTS ON LSP SEMINARS

- 6.1 The LSP noted this report on its recent seminars on 'Housing' and on 'Crime' and on the recent meeting of the Social Cohesion Forum.
- 6.2 The Chair stated that the discussion on housing had been ground breaking and that he hoped it would contribute to the eventual creation of a new council led partnership on housing with the RSLs and other key players.
- 6.3 BP asked why the response to the Leader's question in Appendix 1 had not included the issue of alcohol abuse and stated that in his view the Drugs and Alcohol Action Team needed re-focusing. RL replied that this note from the DAAT to the Chair of the LSP was a response specifically about the number of street based drug users in treatment and did not concern alcohol.

7. OPTIONS FOR 2ND CIVIC FORUM IN MAY 2008

- 7.1 CT introduced this report and recommended that the LSP members approve option two, which was proposing that the Civic Forum should focus on how the LSP could help make Camden a better place for business.
- 7.2 Alistair Subba-Row stated that the nature of the business community in Camden was changing with an inflow of businesses from Westminster and the City. He stated that businesses responded favourably to the clean open spaces which the borough provided. He added that many businesses weren't familiar with the work of the Council and that the focus of this event could be on small and medium sized enterprises perhaps addressing the issue of corporate social responsibility. The event could also address the role of the VCS. He stated that many in the business community did not know how to engage with the council and the event could address how to improve this and could cover such issues as housing and planning.
- 7.3 SJ stated that the business community in the borough had undergone tremendous change in the past few years. The event would need careful planning he added and should not be one size fits all as it would need to attract a wide audience.
- 7.4 CS suggested that a good starting point for developing this event would be the group who developed the borough's LEGI bid and the Chair suggested that a sub group of the LSP could be created to develop this.
- 7.5 Cllr Marshall stated that it would be important to get senior people to attend as they would be able to go back to their organisations and make things happen. He suggested for example people such as Roger Madelin (Argent) or senior executives from Grant Thornton and Olswang. He stated despite the fact that the London Mayoral election would be taking place in May 2008, this event

should attempt to draw representation from the Mayor's Office, Transport for London (Peter Hendy) and the London Development Agency. MG stated that the sub group should first agree whether this event focused on businesses in the borough or on employers.

- 7.6 BP suggested that the event should have a strong sub theme on social cohesion with a focus on residents of the borough and what businesses can do for them. CL added that the idea in option 1, of a progress report on Community Strategy should not be lost and the event could maybe have an element of reporting back. The Chair advised caution here suggesting that this could dilute the event and suggested that other vehicles could be used for this purpose. SH re-iterated the point that there needed to be clarity on whether this event was focusing on businesses, employers or on the local economy.
- 7.7 The Chair thanked everyone for their suggestion and stated that some members would be approached to take part in a Steering Group to develop this event.

The LSP:

- **Agreed to support option 2 as the preferred focus for the second civic forum.**
- **Agreed to establish a Steering Group to develop the event.**

8. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

- 8.1 The minutes of the meeting held on 14 September 2007 were agreed as a correct record.

9. MATTERS ARISING AND FUTURE BUSINESS

- 9.1 The LSP noted the updated work programme for the LSP.

10. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

- 10.1 There was none.

11. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

Tuesday 15 January 2008 at 6.30 pm at Camden Town Hall (LSP debate on tackling worklessness).

The meeting concluded at 12.40 pm