

ITEM 6

DRAFT Minutes of the Camden Local Strategic Partnership Thursday 27 March, 10:30am, Camden Town Hall

Present

- Cllr Keith Moffitt (Chair of LSP), London Borough of Camden, Leader
- Rob Larkman (Vice Chair of LSP), Camden Primary Care Trust, Chief Executive
- Heather Schroder, Director of Children's Services, London Borough of Camden
- Charlie Legg, Camden Community Empowerment Network and Camden Central Community Umbrella
- Pat Stack, Camden Community Empowerment Network and Disability in Camden
- Chris Shaw, Camden Town Unlimited, Chair
- Mick Hickey, Job Centre Plus, External Relations Manager - Central London District
- Richard Bell, Learning and Skills Council, Partnership Director
- Stephen Jordan, London & Continental Stations and Property, Managing Director
- Moira Gibb, London Borough of Camden, Chief Executive
- Michael Quy, London Fire & Emergency Planning Authority, Borough Commander
- Chief Supt Dominic Clout, Metropolitan Police, Borough Commander
- Professor Anthony Kessel, Camden Primary Care Trust, Director of Public Health
- Karen Wilson, Camden Housing Association and Co-op Forum, Chair and Group Chief Executive, Origin Group
- Anju Bhatt, Camden Community Empowerment Network and Interim Director for Camden BME Alliance (in place of Simone Hensby)
- Peter Ward, Camden Community Policing Consultative Group and Board member of the Community Empowerment Network (in place of Barry Peskin)

Also in attendance

- Michael Scorer, London Borough of Camden, Assistant Chief Executive
- Donna Turnbull, Camden Community Empowerment Network, Strategy and Policy Officer
- Louise Matlock, Government Office for London, Locality Manager – North
- Robert Scourfield, London Borough of Camden, Assistant Director Public Realm and Sustainability (Item 4 only)
- Oliver Myers, London Borough of Camden, Interim Head of Sustainability (Item 4 only)
- Claire Tunley, London Borough of Camden, Head of LAA and LSP
- Mary Burguieres, London Borough of Camden, Head of Policy
- Mike Webb, London Borough of Camden, Senior Policy Officer

1 Introductions and apologies for absence

- 1.1 The Chair welcomed Heather Schroeder to the LSP as a new member. He also welcomed Louise Matlock, Donna Turnbull and Mary Burguieres. Apologies were received from Kevin Munslow, Cllr Marshall, Simone Hensby and Barry Peskin. Anju Bhatt and Peter Ward were substitutes for the latter two members.

2 Camden LSP Terms of Reference

- 2.1 Mike Webb presented this item. He explained that the Terms of Reference have been revised in light of comments from the 1 February meeting and the council's Legal Services Team. The major additions are:

- A definition of the three types of LSP member (postholder, elected and co-opted)
- A role description for link members
- A protocol for handling of personal and prejudicial interests
- The ability of the LSP to set up subgroups and working groups is explicitly set out
- A quorum has been defined

- 2.2 Mike also updated the LSP on the nomination of link members to the thematic partnerships:

- Children and Young People's Partnership Board has nominated Heather Schroeder, who has joined the LSP as a result.
- Community Safety Partnership has nominated Dominic Clout.
- Camden Public Health Partnership had already nominated Anthony Kessel as the link member.
- Economic Development Partnership will discuss the issue at its next meeting.

The LSP agreed these nominations.

- 2.3 Dominic Clout suggested that updates from the thematic partnerships become a standing item on the LSP agenda. Moira Gibb agreed but emphasised that only significant or contentious items should be brought to the LSP. This was agreed.

- 2.4 Anju Bhatt wondered why the LAA Steering Group was not mentioned in the subgroups section. Michael Scorer said that it could be disbanded at its next meeting in April, when its members could discuss future arrangements. He added that there needed to be effective arrangements for monitoring the LAA (including the involvement of the voluntary and community sector) while avoiding a proliferation of meetings, particularly given the enhanced role for the thematic partnerships in the LAA.

- 2.5 Rob Larkman asked for the additional sentence in paragraph 2.3 of the Terms of Reference to be deleted. While he understood that technically the Council was indeed responsible for the Community Strategy, mentioning it undermined the spirit of partnership which the Terms of Reference should embody. This was agreed.
- 2.6 The LSP agreed the revised Terms of Reference subject to the change in paragraph 2.5.

3 Camden's Local Area Agreement

2007/08 Quarter 3 financial report

- 3.1 Claire Tunley introduced this report. She said that the Council's Executive had agreed that funds carried forward into the next financial year must be spent on LAA priorities. The end of year financial report will be available at the July LSP meeting but there were no major causes for concern at the moment.

2008/09-2010/11 LAA

- 3.2 Michael Scorer introduced this item. He highlighted the fact that the Council's Executive has approved the timetable in paragraph 4.2 and the draft improvement targets in Appendix 1. He also drew the LSP's attention to Appendix 5, a delivery plan template. The LSP had asked for this to allow them to make evidence-based judgments on progress. As the LSP had already discussed the LAA at previous meetings, he did not give a lengthy introduction to the report. Instead he invited questions as a way to explore the detail.
- 3.3 The Chair emphasised that relevant partnerships and other bodies had been consulted and comments taken on board e.g. the Social Cohesion Forum.
- 3.4 Karen Wilson asked why, given the prominence of affordable housing in the Community Strategy, the related indicators had not been included in the LAA. Michael Scorer replied that there are targets in this area elsewhere. Camden's approach to the LAA has been to include only targets which are not found elsewhere and where partnership can add value.
- 3.5 Claire Tunley added that there had been a long debate about whether to include NI154 (net additional homes provided) or NI155 (gross number of affordable homes delivered). Senior council officers felt they did not have enough influence on NI155 and its methodology and the timescales would make it harder to achieve. She said that NI154 would capture the wider issues around affordable housing while acknowledging that neither indicator was perfect. She added that all public sector organisations had been listed as partners for NI154 as their land resources could contribute towards the target. Chris Shaw

asked why housing associations were not listed. Claire replied that only partners with a statutory duty to cooperate could be included.

- 3.6 Michael Scorer acknowledged Karen Wilson's point and suggested that affordable housing have greater emphasis in the narrative. He stressed again that the LAA involves difficult judgments and working within certain rules. It is confined by where LSP partners can add value.
- 3.7 Charlie Legg proposed two amendments to the narrative. The first related to the ambiguity of the term "affordable" on p. 15, paragraph 5. He suggested that it be replaced by "affordable, social and accessible". Michael Scorer thought that there was a recognised definition of affordable. Karen Wilson confirmed that the Housing Corporation had produced a definition, which is now aligned with the Mayor's previously different definition. Michael Scorer said it would need some consideration as social and accessible were also ambiguous. The Chair suggested a footnote or amendment could provide clarity.
- 3.8 Rob Larkman thought the practical contribution of partners needed to be clear in order for the LSP to be able to hold them to account. Dominic Clout echoed this concern; he wondered how the LSP would be alerted to performance "not going in the right direction" and what action it would take. Perhaps it would leave the issue to the thematic partnerships but there was still the question of time lag between poor performance coming to light and reporting to the LSP. He also suggested that a "red amber green" reporting system be included in the Delivery Plan at Appendix 3.
- 3.9 Claire Tunley replied that Finn O'Brien and Rachel McEvelly of the Council's Performance team were planning to bring a report on performance management to the May meeting. This would clarify where day-to-day responsible for targets would sit. Michael Scorer added that performance will not be solely managed by the LSP; there will be other mechanisms.
- 3.10 Stephen Jordan reminded the LSP that it had executive power only i.e. calling for action, enabling through members rather than taking action itself. Paragraph 5.2 implied that it has levers which don't exist. Michael Scorer agreed and said he would improve the wording.
- 3.11 In reply to Dominic Clout's point about the traffic light system, Heather Schroder said that the Children and Young People's Partnership and the Community Safety Partnership already use them to manage performance within their remit and it was just a question of joining up.
- 3.12 Karen Wilson pointed out a link between this item and Item 5. She apologised for leaping ahead but was concerned that CAA judgments would be based on the entire National Indicator Set not just the LAA. She wanted clarity on what the LSP should focus on. Michael Scorer recognised that the LSP would need to keep an eye on all 198

indicators although obviously it would concentrate its efforts on those included in the LAA because the Audit Commission will place more emphasis on them. The Chair thanked Karen Wilson for raising this point.

- 3.13 Pat Stack asked whether the Delivery Plan would be used for all 198 indicators. Michael Scorer thought probably not. Pat asked how easy it would be to access the delivery plans. Michael replied that this was an important issue and that they would be available electronically. In response to a question from Dominic Clout, he also said that the Delivery Plan template had been developed locally with the aim of avoiding additional burdens as much as possible.
- 3.14 Charlie Legg's second proposed amendment was that "businesses" on pp 16-17 include social enterprises. Claire Tunley accepted this amendment and the Chair added that Business Improvement Districts should also be included.
- 3.15 Anju Bhatt asked whether the Compact for Camden could be included in the Delivery Plan. Claire Tunley replied that she wasn't clear how the Compact could be incorporated as it is a way of working. She added that they could discuss this issue further outside the meeting.
- 3.16 Richard Bell asked what the role of the lead organisation for each indicator was and suggested it be discussed at the LAA Steering Group meeting. Louise Matlock commented that it was up to each LSP to decide on the role, adding some LSPs were revisiting the Terms of Reference of their thematic partnerships.
- 3.17 Louise Matlock said that government had given a strong steer that certain boroughs should include NI35 (combating violent extremism) in their LAAs. However a number of other boroughs had adopted it and Camden had provided a sufficiently strong justification for its approach that hopefully the government would not insist on its inclusion. The Chair said this was a tribute to the work of the Social Cohesion Forum.
- 3.18 However decent homes were another matter. While Louise Matlock understood Camden's position, CLG were adamant it be included in the LAA and the issue would not go away. Michael Scorer said there would be complex negotiations ahead but the fact that it was not included in the LAA did not lessen the Council's commitment to achieving its decent homes target. Moira Gibb added that the focus was now on taking indicators out of the LAA, not adding new ones. There was general agreement around the table that the most useful thing CLG could do to help Camden achieve its decent homes target would be to provide more resources.
- 3.19 The Chair asked whether the partners were happy in principle to have their names next to the targets in Appendix 1. Dominic Clout said that all public LSP partners should be named against NI 1 (% of people who

believe people from different backgrounds get on well together in their local area) because it is so overarching. Public LSP partners agreed to do this. The Chair emphasised that this indicator didn't really capture social cohesion. The public LSP partners also agreed to be partners for the other indicators they were named against in the draft LAA.

- 3.20 The Chair concluded the discussion of this item by saying that the LSP would return to it at its 8 May meeting.

4 Camden's Community Strategy: Camden Together 2007-2012

- 4.1 The progress report on the "Protecting the environment for us and for future generations" Community Strategy sub-theme was introduced by Robert Scourfield and Oliver Myers.
- 4.2 Oliver Myers talked through the paper, highlighting the main points. The length of the report reflects the contribution of partners to the aims of this sub-theme. However it is not exhaustive and perhaps the work of partners which had not been included would be raised during the discussion. The LSP will include two targets in its LAA under this sub-theme, NI 186 (relating to CO₂) and NI 191 (residual household waste), but other indicators in the NIS provide scope for further partnership working e.g. the PCT is contributing towards NI 187 (fuel poverty). Many of the aims of the sub-theme require residents' participation and the LSP should be leading by example.
- 4.3 Section 2 of the report highlighted the work of the Council's Sustainability Team including the development of a communications plan to involve residents. Sections 3-7 set out the range of LSP partners' activities to meet the aims of the sub-theme. Oliver highlighted the emphasis placed on localised energy supply (Combined Heat and Power) and reducing transport use. He finished his presentation by reminding the LSP that it would be discussing the issues in greater depth at its seminar on sustainability on 15 April.
- 4.4 The Chair thanked Robert Scourfield and Oliver Myers for the report. He added that the Council was unusual in having the internal challenge of an Eco-Champion and a Sustainability Task Force but that it provided a healthy tension.
- 4.5 Heather Schroeder commented that this issue was a good example of why the Children and Young People's Partnership needed a representative on the LSP. The "future generations" part of the sub-theme was crucial. She said that there was a lot of work going on to engage young people with sustainability issues but stronger links were needed. She cited two examples; achieving childhood obesity target in the LAA would also have a positive impact on sustainable travel and diet, and the Building Schools for the Future programme would result in a sustainable school infrastructure. She added that there was a wealth

of good practice in schools around encouraging young people to be advocates for sustainability.

- 4.6 Anthony Kessel said that the PCT was putting a lot of resources in 2008/09 into corporate social responsibility, much of which relates to sustainability. He was pleased to see the PCT's work recognised in the report, especially because it had learnt so much from the council in the first place. He stressed the overlap between sustainability and public health issues and said he was happy to share the PCT's practice on areas such as electric car fleets and wind turbines.
- 4.7 Stephen Jordan said there had recently been a sea change in attitudes towards sustainability, particular among businesses. In the last couple of years, corporates have become acutely aware of their carbon footprint, reflected locally in the growing use of Eurostar for business travel. The LSP is pushing at an open door now. He added that Eurostar is very interested in offsetting its carbon consumption locally rather than using more distant and hypothetical schemes. The Chair said the Council was considering a proposal for a borough-wide offset fund to which LSP members and others could contribute and that they would bear Eurostar's offer in mind.
- 4.8 Pat Stack was concerned that estate recycling collections had been stopped and that this had a disproportionate impact on disabled people. He reported that the special arrangements that were supposedly put in place to allow disabled people to recycle turned out to be "not available in your postcode" when people rang the council to enquire about them.
- 4.9 The Chair said that this raised a philosophical question about whether contributing to sustainability was a right or a duty. The Community Strategy puts it in terms of a duty. However the expense of enabling people to fulfil this duty might draw resources away from more effective ways of protecting the environment. Dominic Clout said an Equalities Impact Assessment would have picked up on this issue, adding that it had been a problem in his former borough. Oliver Myers said that accessible recycling was a priority for the council. It had originally meant doorstep collection; however the expense involved had led to its withdrawal. The Sustainability Task Force is looking at other ways to ensure recycling is accessible to all.
- 4.10 The Chair highlighted the role of the individual citizen in meeting the aims of the sub-theme and that this emphasis had influenced the choice of the LAA indicator. He said that the seminar on 15 April would be an opportunity to discuss issues further and that LSP members should start thinking about the possibility of a climate change partnership.
- 4.11 Charlie Legg praised the report and the Chair thanked Robert Scourfield and Oliver Myers.

5 Comprehensive Area Assessment Briefing

- 5.1 Mary Burguieres, Head of Policy, introduced this report.
- 5.2 The Comprehensive Area Assessment (CAA) will replace the current inspection regime for local authorities, the Comprehensive Performance Assessment (CPA) from April 2009. Mary stressed that the key change is indicated by the use of the word “area”, implying a much greater focus on partnership working. Other public sector partners will continue to have their own performance regimes but they will be better aligned with that of the council.
- 5.3 Although the proposals have yet to be finalised, there will probably be three elements to the CAA:
- Annual Risk Assessment
 - Annual Use of Resources statement
 - Annual Direction of Travel statement
- 5.4 The Annual Risk Assessment is crucially forward looking rather than the backward looking CPA. One component of it is a possible self-assessment by the LSP described in paragraph 3.3. Section 4 of the report gives further implications for the LSP.
- 5.5 The Chair commented that the new Terms of Reference would help the LSP to better comply with the self-assessment questions. He added the proposals seem very theoretical at the moment but they will quickly become reality.
- 5.6 Peter Ward asked how the new system balanced “carrots” and “sticks”. Mary Burguieres replied that the new regime was itself a carrot in that it is meant to be light touch, proportional and risk-based. A key factor to be determined is the relative weight of the self-assessments and external judgments. Dominic Clout asked whether the CAA would be more based on self-assessments and Mary agreed. Moira Gibb said that the NIs would be audited and this would make up a major part of the evidence. Louise Matlock added that there will be a much greater emphasis on shared data, which will pose a challenge for government and others. Rob Larkman expressed scepticism about how light touch the CAA would be given these requirements.

6 Reports on LSP seminars

(a) Report on LSP seminar on Neighbourhoods held on 11 March

- 6.1 The Chair thanked CCEN in particular for their contribution to this seminar. He reported that council officers had met to discuss setting up an LSP Working Group, as agreed at the seminar.

(b) Social Cohesion Forum

- 6.2 The Chair introduced the notes of the Social Cohesion Forum's meeting on 28 February. He said that it needed to continue to have the positive influence it had on the LAA process. He mentioned that, as Chair of the Forum, he would be ensuring that actions are followed up through his post-meeting debriefings.
- 6.3 Claire Tunley said that there has been a discussion about the definition of social cohesion under paragraph 2 of the notes. She also mentioned that following on from the decision not to include NI 35 in the LAA, a further meeting was held to discuss how preventing violent extremism should be addressed in the borough.
- 6.4 Pat Stack asked for clarification about paragraph 11 of the notes. Claire said that it was intended to capture forms of extremism other than Islamic e.g. homophobic violence, far right political activity. The Chair said that he would ask for the minutes to be amended to make this clearer.
- 6.5 Richard Bell welcomed the recognition of the work being done by the Learning and Skills Council and Westminster Kingsway College on ESOL funding.

(c) Update on actions from Worklessness seminar held on 15 January

- 6.6 Mike Webb updated the LSP verbally on progress on the action points arising from this seminar. The Economic Development Partnership was addressing many of the points through its LAA targets. However it had not identified offenders as a priority group and would undertake some research to establish whether provision in the borough is adequate. Heather Schroeder commented that young offenders are a major priority for the Children and Young People's Partnership and provision is inspected. The Economic Development Partnership should take this into account when looking at the issue.
- 6.7 Stephen Jordan reminded the LSP that information for business about the employment services was raised as an issue at the seminar. Mick Hickey said that he was giving a presentation to the Economic Development Partnership on Local Employment Partnerships. Heather Schroeder informed the LSP about the three new diplomas that would be introduced in Camden in 2009 for 14-19 year olds for the creative, hospitality and IT industries and she would like greater business involvement in their development.

(d) Update on progress on Civic Forum/Camden Business Summit

- 6.8 Mike Webb tabled a short paper updating LSP members on preparations for this event on 11 June. Chris Shaw commented that it was taking shape and would strongly give out the message that

Camden is open for business. Stephen Jordan added that he saw the event as an icebreaker for businesses and LSP members which would allow them to discuss issues like sustainability and diplomas in a non-threatening environment. In response to a question, Chris Shaw added that delegates would be a mixture of large corporations based in the borough and smaller creative businesses, along with other organisations that are major employers in the borough. Invitees have been carefully selected to preserve the small-scale nature of the event. Stephen Jordan reminded the LSP that no forum for businesses exists in the borough and that the event was an attempt to engage them.

7 Minutes of previous meeting

- 7.1 On behalf of Barry Peskin, Charlie Legg asked for the first line of paragraph 2.5 to be amended by removing "slightly". This was agreed.

8 Matters arising and future business

- 8.1 The Chair will report on the Central London Forum's meeting on 31 March at the next meeting.

9 Any other business

- 9.1 Claire Tunley said that the LSP needed to nominate three members to take part in a government survey and that she would be contacting people directly.
- 9.2 The Chair informed the LSP that the council's Alcohol Strategy would be launched shortly; Mike Webb will send details to members.
- 9.3 As Claire Tunley was about to leave the council, the LSP joined the Chair in thanking her for her invaluable support over the last few years. She would be sorely missed.
- 9.4 The meeting closed at 12:20pm.